The Journal

of

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STUDIES

LIBRARY COPY

Volume Two Number Two

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL BOARD

General Editor
Roger Pearson

Associate Editors

James McClellan
United States Senate Staff

Kenneth W. Watkins
University of Sheffield

Book Review Editor
Robert L. Schuettinger
U.S. Congressional Staff

George Carey
Georgetown University

Sam S. Crutchfield, Jr.
Washington D.C.

James Dornan
Catholic University of America

Ernest van den Haag
New School for Social Research

Thomas R. Haggard
University of South Carolina

John H. Hallowell
Duke University

Russel Kirk
Mecosta

Harvey Mansfield, Jr.
Harvard University

Thomas Molnar
Brooklyn College, New York

Sylvester Petro
Wake Forest University

Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr.
Tufts University

Valene Smith
California State, Chico

Alan Beattie
London School of Economics

David Dilks
University of Leeds

Jürgen Domes
University of Saarbrücken

Daniel Ellegiers
University of Brussels

Julien Freund
University of Strasbourg

Murray Forsyth
University of Leicester

James Mayall
London School of Economics

Helmut Schelsky
Westfälische Universität, Münster

Udo Weiss
University of Heidelberg

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Journal of

SOCIAL and POLITICAL STUDIES

ROGER PEARSON, *General Editor*

Vol. 2 *Summer 1977* No.2

Contents

Changes in the Soviet Defense Posture in Europe 67
by *William Schneider Jr.*

The Rise of Trade Union Power in Britain 73
by *Arthur Shenfield*

Organized Crime and Organized Labor 91
by *Randolph Boehm*

The Spanish Political Scene 107
by *Samuel T. Francis*

World Population Growth 115
by *Robert S. McNamara*

The Soviet-Cuban Offensive in Africa 119
by *Walter Darnell Jacobs*

Book Reviews 126

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Randolph H. Boehm holds a B.A. degree in Political Science from Rutgers University; has been a graduate student in the Department of Philosophy at Georgetown University since 1974 and is currently a Fellow at the Institute for Humane Studies, Menlo Park, California, where he is writing his M.A. thesis: "The Legal Philosophy of Justice: William O. Douglas." He is author of "Organized Crime and Organized Labor."

Samuel H. Francis is a foreign affairs policy analyst for The Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C. He is a Ph.D. candidate in Diplomatic History at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill.

Walter Darnell Jacobs was born in Oklahoma in 1922, and obtained his B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia University in Soviet Area studies and Political Science. After serving in World War II and thereafter in Infantry and Intelligence, he retired with the rank of Colonel to enter upon a teaching career, and is today Professor of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland. During most of his career he has concentrated on Soviet studies, but some years ago became interested in Africa as a result of Soviet intervention in that continent. Currently Chairman of the American-African Affairs Association, which publishes "Spotlight on Africa," he is the author, among other publications, of "At the Sharp Edge of Africa" (1975) and "African Turmoil and American Interest' (1976).

Robert Strange McNamara was born in San Francisco in 1916, and obtained his A.B. from the University of California and his M.B.A. and LL.D. from Harvard. After holding positions at a number of universities, he became an executive and later General Manager of the Ford Motors Company; U.S. Secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1968, and President of the World Bank from 1968 to the present. This article is a condensed version of a theme which he presented at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

William Schneider, Jr., is a Congressional economist defense analyst with a background in technology, and national security policy issues. He was formerly a member of the professional staff of the Hudson Institute, New York. As a staff member at the Hudson Institute, he contributed to studies in the field of ballistic missile defense, strategic nuclear force exchanges, European security issues, counterinsurgency, and international economic policy issues. He is co-author and co-editor (with J. J. Holst) of, *Why ABM? Policy Issues in the Missile Defense Controversy*, co-author and co-editor (with Francis P. Hoeber) of *Arms, Men and Military Budgets* and author of *Food, Foreign Policy and Raw Materials Cartels*; he is also co-author of *Korea in the World Today* and of *South Africa: The Vital Link*.

Arthur Shenfield served as President of the Mont Pelerin Society, an international association of free market economists and political scientists, from 1972 to 1974. In addition to being an economist, he is a barrister, having practiced at the English Bar from 1946-1955. He has held numerous posts in the British government and in the academy. He has been Visiting Professor in the United States at the University of Chicago, Hillsdale College, Rockford College, and, most recently, was Regents Professor of Economics at the University of California, Davis. Among his publications are such monographs as *Agenda for a Free Society, The Nature of Competition, The Political Economy of Tax Avoidance,* and *Restrictive Practices in the European Economic Community*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHANGES IN THE SOVIET DEFENSE POSTURE IN EUROPE

William Schneider Jr.

For more than three decades, the Eurasian land mass has been the focus of Soviet diplomacy and military preparedness. The Eurocentric character of Soviet interest in Europe in particular is not difficult to understand. No natural obstacles prevent an overland invasion of the Soviet Union from Western Europe; thus, the Soviet military establishment is particularly vulnerable to direct attack by modern means of weapon delivery, especially as the principal urban-industrial regions of the USSR lie quite close to NATO nations.

The post- World War II deployment of twenty divisions in Eastern Europe has been considered by the West as primarily an extravagant occupation force not otherwise directed against the nations of Western Europe, particularly since the demise of Stalin. However, this comfortable presumption has been seriously undermined since the late 1960's. After the suppression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 and the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Soviets have increased their investment and, hence, the military effectiveness of their forces in Europe. Since 1968 the Soviet Union has deployed 31 divisions in Eastern Europe supported by a tactical air army, the 16th Frontal Aviation Army. Five divisions are deployed in Czechoslovakia (the Central Group of Forces), two in Poland (The Northern Group of Forces), twenty in Germany (The Group of Soviet Forces in Germany), and four in Hungary (The Southern Group of Forces). These forces, which constitute the Soviet first echelon forces, are supported by 58 divisions deployed in the Western Military Districts in the USSR.(1)

The Soviet Military Doctrine

The Soviet armed forces are organized and trained around substantially different concepts from the Western armies. Therefore one must appreciate some of the more important differences in order to comprehend the significance (2) of the recent changes in the Soviet defense posture in Europe. Unlike NATO forces in Europe, which are organized around lines of Defense

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

along the East German and Czech borders, Soviet forces are organized and deployed to facilitate pre-emption of the military initiative in the event of a crisis.

Soviet doctrine calls for initiating military operations when an attack by an adversary is "anticipated" to permit the Soviet armed forces to execute a Blitzkrieg-style attack on NATO defensive positions in Germany before NATO reserves can be brought to bear.

An assault would commence along five to eight axes of attack along a very narrow front of only two to three miles. The "first echelon" forces (in the European case, the twenty Soviet divisions deployed in East Germany) would attempt to breach the NATO defensive line following massive nuclear and high explosive fire from Soviet missile and cannon artillery and tactical aircraft. (3)

Breaches made in the NATO defensive lines by the Soviet barrage would be exploited by tank columns supported by self-propelled artillery and infantry borne in armored personnel carriers. This first echelon force is composed of 370,000 troops; 7,000 tanks; 2,350 armored personnel carriers; and supported by 900 first-line aircraft and 133 helicopters of the 16th Air Army.

When the initial breach (or breaches) in NATO defensive lines are made, successive echelon forces from the Western USSR Military Districts and Soviet forces based in Eastern Europe would follow to encircle the defending forces and prevent the effective mobilization of NATO reserves behind the front lines. As the NATO forces attempted to establish defensive positions further west, the process would be repeated until the Soviet objective (e.g. the Rhine River, the English Channel, or some other geographical barrier) was reached.

The Soviet manual on their military doctrine does not share the Western sensitiveness for sharp distinctions between conventional, nuclear, and chemical warfare. The Soviets normally indicate that the conduct of warfare should include " all means of attack" mixing conventional, nuclear, and chemical weapons as military effectiveness requires. There are some indications in the writings recently published that a non-nuclear option is plausible, although Soviet modernization programs continue to emphasize comprehensive upgrading of their nuclear as well as non-nuclear forces. The central element of the massive preparations and lavish style in which the Soviet forces are equipped reflects the Soviet concept of "shock power." By truly massive firepower, supplemented by fully mechanized ground forces, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet leadership expects their forces to be able to achieve paralysis of the command apparatus and thus create a total incapacity to respond to the Soviet advance in sufficient time to blunt its drive.

Recent Soviet Deployment Patterns

The invasion of Czechoslovakia resulted in the deployment of five new divisions introduced into the critical front of NATO. Since that time, any pretense that the Soviet forces in the region are being designed for internal security purposes has been eclipsed by events. All Soviet divisions are Category I divisions; they are fully manned and equipped for their wartime mission.(4) If internal security were the only function, only the militarized KGB formations would be employed (approximately 450,000 are currently assigned to this role, primarily for border surveillance in the Soviet Union).

The efforts of the Soviet Union to strengthen its posture in Eastern Europe are far less well-reported than are the Soviet deployments along the Chinese border, and yet the developments in Europe are of much greater significance to both the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The initial efforts in the late 1960's and early 1970's focussed upon equipping the Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe with the most modern weapons: in particular, the T-62 tank; a more advanced logistics system; and improved tactical aircraft, particularly for ground attack purposes. The protracted mobilization which preceded the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 would inhibit the Soviets from effectively executing an attack by surprise (by eliminating the intelligence warning provided to NATO through mobilization); and therefore the Soviets have emphazised improvements in their forces which will make it possible for them to initiate military operations with little warning from positions close to the NATO front lines. In addition, the Soviets have *selectively* emphasized the integration of special units from the Warsaw Pact armies into Soviet military forces.(5) This insures that the Soviet Union will have the best trained and equipped Soviet bloc forces under its direct control.

The pace of change in the Soviet defense posture in Europe has undergone rapid change since 1972. There are a number of hypotheses advanced to explain the sudden Soviet emphasis upon massively upgrading their forces in Europe: some argue that the buildup is related to the Soviet desire to hedge against an agreement at the Conference on Mutual and Balanced Forces underway in Vienna since 1972 with the objective of reducing Soviet and American forces in Central Europe, while others argue that the buildup

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simply reflects a continuation of the post-Czechoslovakia buildup. The character of the post-1972 buildup is of particular concern.

Aspects of the Post-1972 Soviet Buildup in Eastern Europe

The Soviets have initiated the forward deployment of new river crossing equipment with the GSFG (Group of Soviet Forces in Germany). Major river barriers are encountered every 50-60 miles in Western Europe, and in the industrialized sectors of Germany many river banks have vertical concrete structures inhospitable to fording tanks. Recent Soviet maneuvers have shown Soviet ground forces employing advanced river-crossing techniques with new heavy amphibious vehicles, specialized military ferries and modern bridging equipment. Sixteen Soviet Bridging Regiments and six River Crossing Battalions have been reinforced. This implies an important reduction in intelligence warning time compared to the situation in previous years because these river crossing units, essential to maintaining the pace of a mechanized advance across Europe, are deployed with the forces they would support.(6)

The Soviet Union has emphasized artillery more than any Western army. However, they have normally deployed artillery that is towed by a truck or a tracked vehicle. This limits the ability of Soviet mechanized and armored forces to bring their own artillery with them rapidly as they advance. In addition, recent experience (such as the 1973 Arab-Israeli War) has shown that the casualty rate among towed artillery crews is extremely high because they lack the protection available in the armor of the tank-like self-propelled artillery favored by the United States and West Germany. In 1973, the Soviets began deploying self-propelled artillery in large numbers with their Tank and Motorized Rifle Divisions (including 122 and 152 mm types, and a 203 mm nuclear-capable type). This implies an important shift toward even greater mobile artillery fire support for manuevering armored columns.

The number of artillery pieces deployed with Soviet forces in Eastern Europe has doubled since the invasion of Czechoslovakia, with most of the increase taking place since 1972. The deployment of large numbers of cannon artillery has been supplemented by the deployment of a new saturation-fire multiple rocket launcher, and several new missile types including the FROG-7 (capable of delivering a high explosive, nuclear or nerve gas payload), multipurpose free rocket, the SS-12 short-range ballistic missile, and the SCUD-B missile (capable of delivering megaton-class nuclear weapons). To gain some sense of scale, one should understand that the U.S.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possesses about 6,000 cannon artillery pieces of all types world wide. The Soviet Union has over 15,000 deployed west of the Ural Mountains. Moreover, the Soviets are producing new artillery pieces at three times the rate of the United States.

Soviet manpower in Europe has been increased 15 to 20 percent since 1972. This has been done without increasing the number of divisions; each division has been strengthened. Each Motorized Rifle Division has been given an additional tank battalion (to the existing three) consisting of 31 tanks; supporting tank crews and associated infantry and artillery personnel have been increased correspondingly.

The number of Soviet tactical aircraft deployed in Eastern Europe has been increased by 25 percent since 1972. More significantly, the emphasis has shifted from the air defense of Soviet ground forces to ground attack and deep penetration bombers. The quality of the aircraft has been improved to the point where the newer models have range and payload characteristics comparable to NATO types.

Finally, the Soviets have made substantial improvements in their logistics system so that their forces in place are equipped to fight for several days without reinforcement rather than only a few hours as was the case in the early 1960s. This development also implies a reduction in intelligence warning of a surprise attack because of the reduced requirement to move fuel and ammunition to forward positions prior to an attack.

In summary, the Soviet Union has initiated a comprehensive set of improvements to its conventional forces deployed in Eastern Europe that

(a) enhances their capacity to initiate military operations without prior warning;
(b) increases the military effectiveness of Soviet military forces vis-a-vis NATO forces, particularly on the Central Front, which have not kept pace with the Soviet build-up.
(c) makes a successful negotiated reduction of forces in Central Europe virtually impossible to obtain terms likely to leave NATO's security undiminished; and
(d) poses a powerful implied diplomatic threat to the nations of Western Europe that has not been offset by any of the defense programs of the NATO nations including the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW

A journal of scholarship and opinion publishing articles in the fields of philosophy, political science, economics, literature and social criticism. THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW is made available free of charge to faculty and students four times during the academic year by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute. Subscriptions are invited from those outside the academic community: one year, five dollars; two years, nine dollars; three years, twelve dollars. Subscriptions and inquiries should be addressed to: ISI, 14 South Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010.

Contributors to recent issues:

Hanson Baldwin
Louis I. Bredvold
Yale Brozen
George Carey
John Davenport
Henry Hazlitt
Will Herberg
Russell Kirk
Thomas Molnar
Gerhart Niemeyer
Robert Nisbet
Peter Stanlis
Frank N. Trager
Stephen Tonsor
Eliseo Vivas
Robert Penn Warren
Francis G. Wilson
Donald Atwell Zoll

Contributors to previous issues:

Raymond Aron
William Bark
Karl Brandt
Colin Clark
Donald Davidson
M. Stanton Evans
Lawrence H. Gipson
Otto von Habsburg
Arthur Kemp
Willmoore Kendall
William R. Kintner
Ludwig von Mises
Leo Strauss
Robert Strausz-Hupé
Richard M. Weaver
Simon N. Whitney
Frederick Wilhelmsen
David McCord Wright

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RISE OF TRADE UNION POWER IN BRITAIN

By Arthur Shenfield

No feature of life in Britain today is more prominent than trade union power. It is this which presents modern Britain with by far her most difficult problem. For the solution of almost all her political, economic and social problems hinges upon the submission of union power to the superior power of law and its due processes.

At present, to an extent and in a manner unique in the civilized world, British trade unions are outside the ambit of laws applicable to all other persons and organizations. This does not mean that they may do anything they please. Outside the field of trade disputes, the criminal and civil laws apply to them as to others. But it does mean that in pursuit of the aims of a trade dispute, they may do almost anything they please. Acting in pursuit of such aims, they are exempt from the ordinary laws of contract and tort; and in practice, though not exempt in law, they find it easy to evade responsibility for such crimes as wilful damage to property and offenses, such as assault and battery, against the persons of those standing in their way.

As we shall see in the brief rehearsal of British trade union history which follows, exemption from the ordinary laws of contract and tort is of long standing. It existed in periods when Britain was eminently successful in her political and economic affairs, though that does not mean that even then it was not a hindrance to success. In that case why is it now a matter of especial note or importance? Because trade union power has risen to unprecedented heights, and with it so have trade union pretensions. It is not merely that highly oppressive demands are made upon employers, and thus upon the national economy. In fact the wage demands in themselves are no more oppressive than those which are made by trade unions all over the western world; they may indeed be less oppressive than the demands which prevail in some other countries. The more grievous oppression of employers is the exercise of power to disrupt production in numerous ways apart from questions of wages, above all by way of obstacles to improvements in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

productivity where these require some shift from hallowed restrictive practices or from entrenched positions in the factory order. Thus it is that in a growing number of establishments the only man who can be sure that his orders will be obeyed is not the managing director (i.e., president), the production director, or the foreman, but the shop steward. It is this power which is producing the growing paralysis of will and decision among managements which is becoming ever more evident in British industry.

Yet this is not the worst feature of our union power. Its most menacing feature is of another order. Our unions now regard themselves as arbiters of all significant public policies. Social policy, fiscal policy, educational policy, immigration policy, the purposes of national defense itself, are all within their purview – not simply in the sense that, as in other countries, they may take a stance for or against particular parties or candidates for office, but in the more menacing sense that they may use the strike weapon itself, and even threaten to bring the nation to its knees, in pursuit of these wide-ranging aims.

Let us now turn briefly to history. At the end of the 18th century Parliament passed certain acts which outlawed combinations, whether of workers or of employers. They were the famous (or, in the eyes of many, infamous) Combination-Acts. They amounted to an embryonic anti-trust system in the field of labor (the old English common law prohibitions against restraint of trade applied in other fields). However, they were honored in the breach almost as much as in the observance, for there was no proper machinery to apply them. Hence, they fell into disrepute, especially after the end of the Napoleonic wars, when it was possible to describe them, falsely, as the product of wartime hysteria or anxiety. Thus propaganda developed for the view that anti-combination laws were unjust in themselves, and so in 1824 their most important provisions were repealed. Essentially all that remained was illegality of certain types of secret group oaths, and it was under that illegality that the famous "Tolpuddle martyrs" were transported to Australia. Our modern trade unions treat these so-called martyrs as if they were Christians devoured by the lions in ancient Rome, and every year they make a pilgrimage to the village of Tolpuddle in Dorsetshire (familiar to my readers, perhaps, as Thomas Hardy's Wessex). Though they are now the most powerful force in the land, our unions regard themselves as a protest movement, and nothing makes the blood course through the veins of a protest movement so much as the memory, sedulously kept alive, of ancient wrongs and oppressions, whether true or false. In fact, by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standards of the time, the "Tolpuddle martyrs" were dealt with very considerately.

From 1824 to 1875 our trade unions lived a kind of semi-legal existence. They were not proscribed in law, but their legal status was uncertain. In 1875, however, the Conservative Government passed an act which, they thought, gave the unions full legal status and, in the bargain, exempted them from the normal laws of contract and tort, so that a union could not be sued for breach of contract or any tortious act arising solely out of a labor dispute.

Until the 1850's the unions tended to be weak, short-lived, ill-managed bodies of little repute. But by 1875 they had made much progress. In the 1850's skilled unions developed on the well-managed lines which Sam Gompers made familiar in America a generation later; and in the 1880's unions grew rapidly for the semi-skilled and unskilled. Of course this development was largely the result of illusions and misunderstandings. The true aim of the skilled unions was to keep out, and therefore down, the semi-skilled and unskilled. The effect, if not the aim, of the semi-skilled and unskilled unions was to keep out the weakest, poorest and least fit of the semi-skilled and unskilled.

From 1875 to 1901 it was thought that the legal status of the unions was well established in this position of unique privilege. How could the British Parliament, at that time the most eminent legislature in the world and the best instructed in the laws appropriate to a free and orderly society, confer so extraordinary a privilege on these bodies? There were several reasons.

First, there was an important element of mere political maneuver. In 1867 the franchise had been extended to the working class in the towns, though not yet in the country districts. Perceptive politicians could see that this was a fine vote to catch and that the day of manhood franchise for the whole country was not far off. It came in 1884. Thus the 1875 act was in part a cynical and unprincipled pitch for the new labor vote. It worked for a time, but in due course the nemesis that was its due arrived. Most of the labor vote later moved to the Liberal Party, and later still to the Labour Party.

Secondly, there was at work what is, or perhaps more accurately was, one of the most attractive features of life in Britain. Where others, notably Americans, rely upon law, we tend to rely upon convention. It is a sweet and good society which is of such a character that the citizen can rely on his fellow-citizens to act decently by convention, without the trammels of law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Britain some things are done and some things are not done, or at least that is how it used to be. In the early days British unions displayed a good deal of unruliness and violence. But by 1875 they were respectable bodies, run by respectable men. They could be relied upon not to abuse their newly-conferred legal privilege, it was thought.

Unfortunately this has turned out to be a case of what scholars know as *corruptio optimi pessima est* — the corruption of the best is the worst. We have produced a monster in our trade union movement in large part because for a long time we thought it safe to let it have a uniquely privileged status in law. It is of course true that our unions have been, and continue to be, free from racketeers and criminals in leadership. We have never been plagued by a Jimmy Hoffa or a Dave Beck. No British miners' leader has ever murdered his rival, a la Tony Boyle; though this is not to say that at the lower levels there is no thuggery or skulduggery — unfortunately in minor forms there is a great deal of it, and it is growing. But the trade union movement is a monster not because it kills or maims people, or misuses its investments or robs its members' pension funds, but because it has come to be invested with immense irresponsible power. The power is irresponsible not merely because non-members, still a majority of the people, have no share in it, but also because most unions are in practice, vis-a-vis their members, utterly undemocratic. The ordinary member is a mere pawn in the hands of his leaders, whose power rests principally upon the voices of small groups of activists.

Thirdly, there was in 1875 and for fifty years thereafter reason to believe that in practice the legal privilege could not be abused to a significant extent. At that time the British economy was essentially a free market economy.

In 1901 the extra-legal status of the unions was challenged in the courts in a famous case known as the *Taff Vale* case. The case went to the House of Lords, i.e., the Supreme Court, which decided that the unions had no right to the status which almost everyone had thought the 1875 act had conferred on them. The unions were stunned. They reacted by establishing a Labour Representation Committee to promote the election of candidates to Parliament under a labor flag, and out of that there grew the modern British Labour Party.

In 1901 the Government was Conservative, and it accepted the decision of the House of Lords in the *Taff Vale* case. But in 1906 it was defeated by the Liberals in a landslide election, and almost immediately the Liberal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government passed the Trades Disputes Act (1906) which not only restored what had been thought to be the pre-1901 union status but also entrenched it. In particular, in addition to making it quite clear that unions acting in pursuit of a trade dispute were exempt from contractual or tortious liability, it protected the right of "peaceful picketing" on a definition which in practice meant any picketing at all; and nothing enhances union power so much as the implied threat of violence in the kind of picketing which unions aim to practice if they are allowed.

The Liberals took this step partly to repay a political debt to their working class vote, and partly to retain that vote in the future. They soon met their well-merited nemesis. In that same year, 1906, the Labour Representation Committee transformed itself into the Labour Party and elected over thirty MP's. The Liberals deluded themselves for a time into thinking that their game had succeeded because the Labour MP's supported them on most issues against the Conservatives. But one did not need more than half an eye to see that the Labour group was a cuckoo in the Liberal nest, and it did not take many years for the Labour Party to supplant it as one of the two major political parties.

When the Labour Representation Committee was established, it introduced a political levy which looms large in the long history of political debate on union power. The purpose of the levy was to finance propaganda, promote the election of MP's, and provide Labour MP's with some sustenance, for until 1911 MP's received neither salary nor expenses. The system was based on "contracting out"; that is to say, every union member was automatically charged with the levy unless he positively signified his desire to be exempt. Of course this was a system of unpopularity to cause many members not to contract out even though they had no sympathy for the unions' political aims.

In 1913 this system was challenged in the courts, and the House of Lords declared it to be unlawful. Hence it had to be replaced by "contracting in." Thus only those paid the political levy who positively signified their desire to do so. However, the Liberals were still in power, and they still hankered after the labor vote. So they passed an act which restored the status quo, and we had contracting out again. Thus the Liberals hastened the digging of their own grave, for contracting out simply increased the funds directed by the unions to support the Labour Party.

World War I, 1914 to 1918, greatly strengthened the unions, for labor became scarce, free markets were ousted by central governmental controls,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Government looked to the unions to aid it in mobilizing the labor force for war production. The economic dislocations caused by the war produced a fertile ground for economic trouble in the post-war peace, and economic trouble meant labor discontent, which in turn meant a growth in strength for the unions and the Labour Party. Thus in 1924 the first Labour Government was elected. But it was only a minority Government, because though the Labour Party was the largest in Parliament, it was outnumbered by the Conservatives and Liberals when they combined; and so it lasted less than a year.

In 1926 we had the General Strike. This was a revolutionary move by the unions because it was a challenge to Parliamentary government itself. It collapsed after nine days, partly because of the resolute resistance of the Government, largely inspired by Winston Churchill, but partly also because the union leaders of those days had not really become accustomed to the ideas of great power and had little stomach for a fight against the nation.

We must note with regret that this was the last time in British history that the unions were beaten by the Government. And unfortunately, instead of taking advantage of their victory and proceeding to reshape the law so as to bring union power to heel and deprive it of extra-legal privilege, the Government held out an olive branch to the unions. The prevailing view was "These chaps are not really bad or dangerous. They did not really wish to destroy constitutional government. After all there was very little violence in the General Strike. Did not many strikers and policement fix up soccer games against each other: Does that not show what a civilized people we are? Let us be content with the victory of law, and let there be no painful retribution." Thus all the Government did was to pass an act abolishing contracting out and re-establishing contracting in. For the rest, the old, easy-going extra-legal system was allowed to continue.

World War II strengthened the unions and the Labour Party even more than World War I. Immediately after the war the Conservatives were defeated, and Labour came in. Despite all his services to the nation, Churchill was thrown out and Attlee, his deputy in the wartime coalition, came in. Attlee was described by Churchill as "a sheep in sheep's clothing," and the gibe was perhaps almost as true as it was clever; but in fact Attlee's Government was an extremely active one. Assiduously it gnawned away at the foundations of British prosperity and busily laid out the lines for future economic decay. Thus, although Attlee and his leading colleagues were conspicuously honorable and patriotic men by comparison with the present

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Party leaders, and though the union leaders of that time were outstandingly commonsensical and modest by comparison with their present-day successors, the major responsibility for the sad decline of Britain must be laid at the door of Attlee's Government. Naturally almost the first thing it did was to abolish contracting in and restore contracting out; and contracting out is still the rule today. In 1951 the Conservatives returned to power, but they were tired of fighting the unions, and so they did not restore contracting in. Churchill had said, in reference to international war, that "jaw-jaw was better than war-war," and jaw-jaw with the unions, not war-war, was to be the rule of the day.

As Britain's economic performance became more and more clearly second-rate, people naturally cast about for an explanation. In the eyes of millions it was the selfishness and shortsightedness of the unions. In part this was obviously an unchallengeable view. The erosion of industrial discipline, the fatuous attachment to restrictive practices which above all else kept the workers themselves poor, the mindless opposition to improvements in productivity where these required economies in the use of labor (which, contrary to the common blinkered view, are the source not merely of rising prosperity but also of rising employment), all these were obvious features of union attitudes and also obvious features of Britain's industrial decline. This view is sometimes challenged by a parade of statistics of time lost in strikes, which appear to show that in this regard Britain's record is by no means the worst in the western world, that on the contrary there are several countries doing well industrially which have worse figures of time lost in strikes, and that therefore Britain's poor economic performance must be caused by something else, for example, poor management. There is no substance in this defense. In the first place not only do the statistics lack comparability because of differences in the coverage of establishments, but more importantly they do not indicate, in the British case, the true extent of time lost by strikes. Thus if 100 men are in a components factory strike causing 1000 men to be laid off in a car assembly plant, the figure in the statistics is that of the time lost by the 100 men only! In the second place the main losses caused by union power or worker unruliness flow not from strikes but from managements' fear of strikes. In fact, if we had more strikes the state of British industry would probably be healthier than it is, for that would indicate a greater vitality among managements. Of course it is true that most of our managements have defects. So do most American, German, Japanese, French and other managements, though the defects may vary from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country to country. But where British managements are exceptionally defective, the most prominent cause is the sapping of will and decision caused by union power itself, to which reference has been made above.

However, in part, and a very important part, the growing animus against the unions was misconceived. Obviously a large element in our malady was inflation, running a higher rate than in most other comparable countries. And who caused inflation? Obviously, it was, and still is, widely thought, the unions. It was they who demanded unreasonably high wage increases, which raised costs and thus raised prices. There is nothing especially British about this view of inflation. It is prominent almost everywhere. However it is false. Unions do not cause inflation because they cannot – at least not in the manner envisaged by this erroneous view. Excessive wage claims cannot cause prices to rise in general or on the average, because that cannot happen without an increase in the effective quantity of money; and the quantity of money is not in the control of the unions or their members. Unions may be, and ought to be, indicted on a dozen counts of great gravity, but the most prominent count in the bill of indictment most commonly drawn up against them, namely that they directly cause inflation, is the one count on which they have to be found not guilty. This is a most unfortunate error because, for reasons set out below, it actually fortifies the unions and increases their menacing power.

This is not to say that union power has nothing to do with inflation. Unfortunately it has a lot to do with it, but only indirectly. Only governments can and do cause inflation. But who are the most vigourous and insistent promoters of inflationary governmental policies? The unions. Let any Government screw its courage to the sticking point and resolutely determine to end inflation by controlling its expenditure and hence its need to create money, and it will meet with the implacable hostility of the unions. Thus, in this sense the unions are accessories before and after the fact to inflation. But this is not the way in which the general public tends to view the matter. The prevailing view is that the unions are principal culprits.

This prevailing view has had most unfortunate consequences for Britain and the British economy. If wage demands are the direct cause of inflation, then the unions must be either persuaded or forced to moderate them. Hence Government after Government, whether Conservative or Labour, has tried to operate a so-called incomes policy, on a basis sometimes voluntary, sometimes compulsory. It has been a uniformly ignominious failure (there are those who claim that in its present phase it is a success; though all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

previous efforts have failed, but more of that below). It has been a case of the triumph of hope not only over experience but also over analysis. The British used to claim that they were of the bulldog breed, that when they got their teeth into something they did not give up, and that if at first they did not succeed, they tried, tried, tried again. Unfortunately the man who, having failed to square the circle, tries, tries and tries again, will have to keep trying until Kingdom come. Incomes policies fail because they must. It is fortunate for the American people that President Nixon's incomes policy of August 15, 1971 did not last long, for if it had, it would have done more harm to the United States than the "third rate burglary" of 1972. All the British attempts at incomes policies have failed, and in failing they have injected highly damaging distortions into the British economy.

In 1964 the Conservative Government, which had been in office since 1951 and had survived three general elections, fell and was succeeded by Labour, which held the Government until 1970. Even the Labour Government, whose party depended upon union finance and voting support, felt the effect of the growing animus against the unions, and after some years produced a statement of policy entitled "In Place of Strife," which proposed a reshaping of the law so as to make the unions amendable to law. The light of truth seemed to have struck even a Labour Government at last, as if from on high. But the reaction of the unions was so fierce that the Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, and his Minister of Labor, Barbara Castle, hastily withdrew the document, and thereafter repeatedly claimed that they had never meant anything so dastardly as the reform of the unions' extra-legal status. Since such a reform had been the clear intention of "In Place of Strife," this cowardly repudiation indicated not merely the great power of the unions but also the sad descent in terms of honor and principle of the Labour Party leadership from Attlee to Wilson.

In 1970 the Conservatives returned to office under the leadership of Edward Heath, who decided that he would show that Conservatives were made of sterner stuff than Socialists. Accordingly he promoted and had passed an Industrial Relations Act which really did revise the law relating to unions fundamentally and thus abolished their extra-legal status. Under this act a special branch of the High Court was established to deal with labor cases, which to some extent followed the model in Australia, where the courts have dealt with labor cases for many years. In Britain the courts enjoy high prestige, founded on high competence and unchallengeable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impartiality, and it was thought that not only the general public but also the unions themselves would regard the decisions of the new court with the utmost respect.

In numerous respects the Industrial Relations Act was an excellent achievement. Without doubt it displayed the great superiority in intelligence and principle of Mr. Heath and his colleagues over their Labour predecessors. Yet it was not without serious defects. And in any case it failed. First, in order to make it not wholly unpalatable to the union leaders, it actually strengthened their power in important respects. Thus, for example, it gave the unions the right to enforce the closed shop by law, subject only to their satisfying the conditions laid down in the act for their registration as unions. This was an immense concession. Hitherto the unions had often imposed a closed shop in practice, but that was only by the use of their bargaining muscle. There was no law which gave them the right to require a dissident worker to join a union as a condition of employment, and employers had to take account of the legal right of a worker not to join a union if they were inclined to submit in practice to union demands for a closed shop.

Secondly, registration as a union under the act was not made compulsory. This was a grave error which enabled the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the second largest union in the country, to declare that it recognized neither the act nor the court. To those Britons who had been brought up for generations to believe in the supremacy of Parliament and the majesty of the courts, this was a fantastic situation. Not since the days before the Reformation, when clerks in holy orders and others holding Church appointments could claim benefit of clergy and exemption from the jurisdiction of the lay courts, had such a position been asserted by anyone. Perhaps better than anything else this illustrated how many union leaders had come to regard the unions as a power independent of the State, as the Church did in medieval times. It is true that the court was able to levy fines upon the engineering union when it fell foul of certain provisions of the act which applied to all unions, but in paying the fines its leader, Mr. Hugh Scanlon, contemptuously declared that all he had to do was to wait until the next Labour Government was elected, when the act would surely be repealed and the union would get its money back – an expectation that proved to be entirely correct. It is hard to imagine that in Britain of all countries so contemptuous a blow could be aimed at a fundamental principle of law, for the repeal of an act does not mean that fines lawfully imposed during its currency are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refundable. The episode is a stark illustration of the shameful depths to which Britain has sunk in certain respects.

Thirdly, the act failed because it was only one half of Mr. Heath's strategy. The other half was a compulsory incomes policy, which brought him into conflict with the unions, and in particular the coal miners' union. In this conflict he was defeated, and his Government came to an end. In February 1974 he called a general election, but lost it, and Mr. Wilson became Prime Minister again at the head of a Labour Government.

Mr. Heath's defeat was a disaster for the nation. Yet he deserved to be defeated. First, he chose a battleground on which he was sure to be defeated. Secondly, he failed to prepare properly for the battle.

The battleground on which he chose to fight was that of his incomes policy, i.e., his wage and price controls. There are numerous reasons why incomes policies do not succeed, and one of them is the very belief in their possibility of success. For if wages and prices can be kept down by one governmental hand, it must be safe for the other governmental hand to expand the quantity of money with a view to promoting employment and prosperity. But the expansion of the quantity of money produces pressures which inevitably break the control of wages and prices. Mr. Heath was so confident of success with his controlling hand that he expanded the quantity of money with his other hand at a rate surpassing that of any of our previous profligate Labour Governments! Failure was thus inevitable.

Furthermore, no competent general chooses to fight on an issue which fortifies his enemy's morale and rank and file support. Picture the position of the union leaders. A large number of their members are in the union because of inertia or because of the fear of violence. Very many have no sympathy at all for their leaders' political aims or ideology – some 30% to 40% of union members in Britain tend to vote Conservative. A great many know that their leaders' wage demands can often be unrealistic. In these circumstances the discipline of the union army is not normally of the highest order. But now consider the situation when a Government imposes wage controls. The workers know that the employers can pay more than the Government allows. That is the very meaning of wage controls, for if higher wages could not be paid, there would be no need for the controls. Indeed, in the usual case many employers are anxious to pay more in order to get the labor they need. In this situation the Government presents itself as the enemy of all the workers. And in opposing the Government the union leaders are not talking dubious political theory; they are talking realistically

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about wages as a bread and butter issue. Hence a battle on wage controls gives the leaders maximum rank and file support. This is why the point was made above that an incomes policy fortifies the unions and increases their menacing power. Thus Mr. Heath's choice of battleground was sadly misconceived.

His lack of preparation for the battle was perhaps even more unwise. When the coalminers' leaders presented an extravagant wage claim, coal stocks were high, especially at the coal-burning power houses, and it appeared that the country could sit out a strike for a considerable time. But the almost unlimited right of picketing had not been changed in the Industrial Relations Act, which was another grievous defect in it. So the miners sent out flying pickets to stop the delivery not only of coal (though most of the coal was already *in situ* where it was most needed), but also of oil to the many oil-burning power houses! In addition they made it clear that they would stop the import of foreign coal (which was already cheaper than British coal at the existing level of miners' wages), if the Government tried to arrange it. The pickets made no bones about what they would do in pursuit of their aims. It was the most flagrant threat of violence imaginable. And Mr. Heath was powerless because he had not prepared for the battle by making illegal not only mass-picketing and violence-threatening picketing, but especially the picketing of establishments (like the oil-burning power houses) not concerned in the wage dispute.

Furthermore, one of the most nonsensical elements in our situation is the right of the wives and children of strikers to receive social relief benefits from the State. This largely relieves the unions from spending their own money on strike pay. In addition the withholding tax system for wage-earners is so organized that when a worker misses a week's pay (as a striker does), his tax is immediately recalculated and some of it refunded (because for a given amount of earnings the tax payable over n+1 weeks is less than that over n weeks). Hence during the first week of a strike and often longer, most strikers find money flowing in from the Revenue. Thus in two ways the unfortunate taxpayer relieves the striker of most of the cost of striking, even when the strike is aimed at the taxpayer himself (for it is the taxpayer who has to meet the ultimate losses of nationalized coal). It is not surprising that the miners' union was able to boast that it had no need to spend money on strike pay, and so could spend large sums on sending its pickets all over the country. A circumspect general in Mr. Heath's shoes would have changed all this before letting the battle commence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Despite these errors Mr. Heath only lost the decision of February 1974 by a very small margin. A deeply worried nation could see that the real issue was, who was to govern it? Was it to be the constitutionally elected and responsible Government in Parliament, or was it to be the unconstitutional private despotism of the unions? I believe that if Mr. Heath had shown that he really could beat the miners, he would have received the enthusiastic support of the electors. But if he was going to lose, then a sufficiently large part of the nation would decide that it was better to have a Labour Government which by its nature could talk sweet reasonableness to the unions, as a Conservative Government could not. Yet the choice, though understandable, was disastrous.

Since February 1974, and fortified by a slightly better result in a further election in October 1974, the Labour Party has been in office. From the beginning it declared that in dealing with the unions sweet reasonableness was to be the order of the day. It would end the folly of the "provocative" Industrial Relations Act and of the compulsory control of wages, but it would continue the compulsory control of prices. Naturally, for though unions hate the control of wages, they see every virtue in the control of prices. It is only businessmen, who mostly do not vote for Labour candidates, who object to control of prices. Having repealed the obnoxious Industrial Relations Act and terminated Mr. Heath's wage controls, the Labour Government would negotiate a "social contract" with the unions, under which, in return for these and other well-merited favors, the unions would agree to voluntary restraint upon their wage demands.

The "social contract" is one of the most remarkable examples of political legerdemain ever seen. Indeed, like a conjurer's prop, it has not been made available to be seen, except by mirrors. Its terms have never been spelled out to Parliament or people. All that has been vouchsafed to the public is that, whatever has been done by the unions, and whatever the Government has done for the unions, has been within the "social contract."

However, viewed through the proper mirrors, the essential features of the "social contract" can be clearly discerned. In return for agreeing to a measure of voluntary wage restraint, the unions have been given not merely the repeal of the Industrial Relations Act and the abolition of the court set up under that act but also an extension of their power well beyond the already extraordinary level that they enjoyed before the act was passed. In effect the Government has said to the unions, "You are the masters now. Tell us your bidding and we will run to perform it." Thus all interests

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outside the unions are treated as of no account. Indeed the self-abasement of the Government plumbs deeper depths. For the interest of the unions is not monolithic. There are large unions and small unions, strong unions and weak unions, and their interests often conflict. It is understandable that a Government will pay more attention to the interests of large and strong unions than to those of small and weak ones. But what can one say of a Government that licences a strong union to take away the jobs of members of a weaker union and hand them to its own members by force of law? This is what the Labour Government has done. The strong union concerned is the Transport and General Workers Union, the largest in the land, and headed by Mr. Jack Jones. A Labour Government is not necessarily exempt from criticism by union leaders, and it is often pained by such criticism. But Jack Jones has declared that he will support the Labour Government through thick and thin. For him the maintenance of a Labour Government is the ark of the covenant. Hence whatever Jack Jones may want he may have, and the devil take the hindmost. And as set out below, he has wanted a lot.

Oddly enough the Labour Government has succumbed to such abasement largely because it has the same view of inflation as Mr. Heath had. Why, in the eyes of good Labour men, do prices rise? In a free market no doubt in large part because of capitalist greed, but this can be dealt with by control of prices. If, despite compulsory control of prices, they still rise, it is because costs rise. And why do costs rise? In large measure because wages rise. Hence wage restraint or control is the remedy, though Heaven forefend that it should be compulsory. In short, even in Labour eyes, the unions can be the cause of inflation. For this reason the Labour Government regards the voluntary restraint of the "social contract" as a triumph, the first example of an incomes policy which has really worked. Therefore whatever problems beset it (e.g., the awful dangers of a collapsing pound and the need to go cap in hand to the International Monetary Fund for loans) and whatever demands the unions, or at least Jack Jones, may make, the "social contract" is sacrosanct. Indeed it is constantly paraded before the world, and especially to the American and German Governments and the International Monetary Fund, as proof of the underlying soundness of the British situation and justification for generous financial assistance.

What is the truth about their supposedly successful incomes policy? The unions agreed to a maximum increase of £6 per week (£312 per annum) for wages and salaries not higher than £8500 per annum. Above that level

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(where of course few union members are to be found) there was to be no increase at all. Though the £6 per week was stated to be a maximum, the unions quickly construed it to be an entitlement. This was the magnanimous restraint and self-denial which the unions offered the nation. The verdict of impartial judgement upon it is not hard to find. First, it has not abated inflation at all. Despite confident assertions or forecasts to the contrary by the Government, the rate of inflation has remained very dangerously high. If it has fallen a little below the all-time peak of 1974-75, that has been due to slightly less lax control over the money supply. But has not the wage restraint facilitated a better control over the money supply? No, it has not. The money control has been slightly less lax because the Government has abandoned the race for growth and artificially engendered full employment of the Keynesian model.

Secondly, though this incomes policy has indeed meant restraint for some workers, it has almost certainly not meant restraint for the working force taken as a whole. Given the economic conditions of the time, the working force as a whole could not have obtained more than the agreed limit itself. Thus in effect the unions have given nothing in return for the munificent favors of the "social contract." Thirdly, even the control of inflation can be bought at too high a price. The damaging effects of the "social contract" upon the British economy and polity are so great that they would have been too heavy a price to pay even if the "social contract" had truly been a remedy for inflation.

So far the benefits to the unions are mainly contained in the Employment Protection Act and the Dock Labor Bill (shortly to become an Act), though there are more to come in further legislation. The Employment Protection Act provides a menu that would satiate the appetite of the most fervent trade unionist, were it not that the appetite grows with eating. First, it provides legal power to enforce the closed shop. Secondly, it establishes strict rules on hiring and firing, giving the unions rights of consultation and providing compensation from the employer when an employee is dismissed except for some serious misbehavior or breach of duty. Thirdly, it gives the right to a union, when entering into negotiations, to demand from the employer information on his business which hitherto would have been kept confidential.

The Dock Labor Bill illustrates the pitiable subservience of the Government to Jack Jones and his Transport and General Workers Union. That is the union to which most dock workers belong. Already the union's power

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had given the dockers in the major ports, such as London, Liverpool, and others, extraordinary privileges. They had the sole right to do the work of these ports, and the right was granted for life. Their dock work naturally fluctuates in volume (which is why the dock employers formerly used to hire casual labor); sometimes there is work to be done and sometimes there is not. In either case the dockers draw their wages. The results of this system were inevitable. The loading and discharge of ships at the major ports, became inefficient and costly, thus imposing a tax on every man, woman and child in the country. The opportunity thus arose for some minor ports, which had been left out of this system, to grow and flourish. Their employers made profits, their dockers earned good wages, and their importers and exporters enjoyed the benefit of lower costs. Accordingly Jack Jones and his union required that these rising ports be nationalized and brought within the dock labor system. Hence the Dock Labor Bill. Furthermore, the Bill as first passed by the House of Commons provided that all work concerned with the transhipment of goods within five miles of any coastline or navigable river should be reserved for registered dockers. This meant that many jobs would have had to be taken away from other workers and handed for life to Jack Jones's members, with of course less service for more money. It is necessary to bear in mind that Britain is a country watered by very many rivers and with an extremely long coastline in proportion to its area, in order to grasp the enormity of this provision. Fortunately the House of Lords was able to use its very slender power of revision to reduce the purview of this provision to half a mile from the coastline or navigable rivers, but its extraordinary principle remains intact.

Soon, if the Labour Government survives, there will be legislation to provide for mandatory worker representation on the Boards of Directors of companies above a certain size (probably those employing 2000 or more, and 50% worker representation). This is partly inspired by the widespread but false notion that this kind of system has been an important element in the success of German industry. However, it will not be worker representation in the prospective British case, for the unions do not believe in worker representation. They believe in union representation, not worker representation. Thus under the name of worker representation it will be the unions which will have the right to appoint the "worker directors" to the company Boards. It would be hard to think of a more perfect prescription for the further destruction of the health and vigor of British industry.

The situation in which Britain finds itself is not new. Centuries ago

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there were powerful barons who, with their private forces of retainers and liegemen, were able to make or break the weak kings who formally ruled the country. But this did not last. Strong kings arose who broke the power of these unruly barons. The modern baron is the union leader, and his liegemen are the workers who are dragooned into the union system. But this cannot last. It is a prescription for tyranny and poverty. Sooner or later a strong Government will arise which, unlike Mr. Heath, will choose a winning battleground and will prepare circumspectly for the battle with our modern barons. The question before the British people (and for other peoples whose union leaders have some of the characteristics of the medieval barons) is whether the battle can be so waged that the result will be the reestablishment of constitutional Parliamentary government, or whether the outcome will be some form of authoritarian or totalitarian government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Contents of Last Issue

- **The United States and Cuba: Yesterday and Today**
  by Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.
- **Meeting the Soviet Military Challenge: Options and Non-options**
  by Senator Gary Hart
- **Strategic Arms Limitations: Some Recommendations**
  by Jack Kemp, M.C.
- **Four Presidents and The Conduct of National Security Affairs-Impressions and Highlights**
  by General Andrew J. Goodpaster
- **The 25th Soviet Party Congress: The Arrogance of Global Power**
  by Richard S. Soll
- **Berlin; Continuing Focal Point For East-West Relations**
  by Peter C. Hughes and M.R. Edwards
- **Devolution In the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**
  by Owen A. Hartley

Editorial Address: Council on American Affairs, †210, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington D.C. 20036. Business and Subscriptions to: The Publisher, Journal of International Relations, Boston, Virginia 22713
Annual Subscription rate (quarterly) $12.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ORGANIZED CRIME AND ORGANIZED LABOR

by Randolph Boehm

In the United States organized crime derived its first large-scale financing from activities made possible by adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment. That amendment prohibited the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within the United States for beverage purposes. Although the prohibition amendment made the purchase of alcoholic beverages illegal, it did not of course do anything by itself to change consumer wants or preferences for alcoholic beverages. The wants of millions of potential consumers continued unchanged. Moreover, there would be consumers who possessed the financial resources to purchase what they wanted.

On the other side of the market foreign producers of alcoholic beverages were entirely prepared to sell at prices acceptable to American consumers. With the passage of time they were joined by an ever-increasing number of domestic producers who believed that the rewards from their illegal activities exceeded the risks. What was now required were persons or organizations that had the capability to bring buyers and sellers together. This market-making function proved to be admirably suited to the talents of organized groups of criminals. In brief, the legal market in alcoholic beverages was replaced by an illegal one. The enormous financial returns accruing to organized crime from its organization of the illegal market were the direct consequence of the coercive actions of the state in depriving consumers of legal ways of satisfying their wants for alcoholic beverages.

Our national labor laws compel millions of employees to join (or to support) unions or to give up their employment. Moreover, the terms upon which the organized employee supplies his services to the market are negotiated by a union which enjoys by statute the exclusive right to represent him. And, on the other side of the market, the employer can only buy the employee's services on the terms established in negotiations with the union. Under these arrangements the union, as an organization, brings buyers and sellers of the services together. The opportunities for the fraudulent acquisition of huge sums of money — made possible by these arrange-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments – have long been apparent to organized crime. A union under criminal control can offer an employer the services of an employee at rates well below the negotiated ones, and, in a wide variety of circumstances, the employee will accept the sub-union rate in preference to the other employment alternatives open to him. But, this is only one example of the many ways in which control of a union can be exploited for the pecuniary benefit of organized crime.

THE METHODS OF LABOR RACKETEERING

Although the term "organized crime" is almost as difficult to define as the term "Mafia," there are several types of union and union-related activity which may be defined as organized rackets. We will analyse each of these and, where data permit, give concrete examples. A first assumption, obviously enough, is that there are two organized associations – a labor union and a criminal "syndicate" or group. An interesting question seldom regarded as such in the literature on labor racketeering is: which one of these associations initiates the criminal activity? It is usually assumed that the union is the victim of external parasites and evidence shows this is often the case. But it is also possible to support the contention that labor unions may initiate collusion by seeking various criminal services. The possibility of either organization acting as instigator should be borne in mind as the various methods of criminal activity are listed and described.

Illegal Kickbacks On Pension Fund Loans

Union pension funds are lucrative game for organized crime, and illegal kickbacks on pension fund loans have received some publicity over the past few years. The pension fund loans may be awarded, not on the basis of sound lending practices, but to whoever is willing to pay a "finder's fee" to a middleman. Not surprising, the middleman receiving the fee is either a union official or an organized crime "consultant." Thus, the pension funds of labor's rank and file are channeled into unwise, even spurious, investments as union officials and "consultants" skim profits. This practice produces a double loss to the employee; the "finder fees" themselves and losses due to uncollectable loans. With this tremendous drain, it is not surprising that pension fund officials are constantly searching for new pretexts on which to base a denial of benefits. There are many instances of this type

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of racket recorded in the public literature, particularly in journalistic accounts. Some of the more notorious cases involve the conviction of Allen Dorfman of the "Chicago Syndicate" who received a kickback while acting as financial consultant to the Teamster's Pension Fund in 1972. More recently, Anthony Provenzano – former president of the New Jersey Teamster's Local 560 – was indicted in December of 1975 on the same type of charge. Provenzano is reputedly a member of the Genovese family.

Labor Contract Extortion

There are many aspects to labor contract extortion, the most blatant being extortion through "paper locals" (chartered unions with no members). A union official may threaten an employer with violence, for example, if the employer doesn't pay a certain amount in monthly dues for each of his employees. Payments are extracted although union cards are never issued and union benefits never disbursed. The "Gallo Organization" in Brooklyn was notorious for this type of operation. Investigations in Western and Southwestern states have revealed a startling pattern of organized crime violence used to force union shop or agency shop contracts: the obvious attempt here is to provide a semi-legal justification for the extraction of even more money going to the union local, whether it is a "paper local" or not. It is also reported that "paper locals" are bought and sold as assets by organized crime bosses.

Sharing Of Crime "Profits" With Collusive Union Officials

This category refers to instances where officials have used union office to assist criminal activities for personal gain. While there are a number of cases of outright thievery by union officials, this racketeering method is most notorious in organized theft rings assisted by cargo conveyance unions. Pilferage has long been considered a severe problem on docks controlled by the International Longshoremans Association at the Port of New York and at the Teamster-controlled loading docks at Kennedy International Airport. Typically, a union official and one or more members will serve, for payment or a slice of the "action," as sources of critical information to aid organized crime thefts from commerce in transit or storage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Use Of Unions To Inhibit Competition And Further The Interests Of "Front" Or Otherwise Legitimate Businesses Controlled By Organized Crime

A classic example of this method of labor racketeering was Al Capone's use of the Bartenders' Union in Chicago to monopolize the brewing business after the end of Prohibition. Another major example is seen in union-induced strike threats, for purposes other than labor contract negotiations where the goal is to force employers to deal with controlled companies. Benjamin Ross and John "Dio" Dioguardia, have each been identified in the literature in respect to this method.

Employee Kickbacks To Secure Or Retain Jobs

This type of operation is most notorious in the construction and stevedoring unions. Where formerly the practice involved blatant cash installments on payday, the *New York Times* has reported more recently that kickbacks are often indirect, e.g., employees who frequently play numbers or do business with "shylocks" are awarded overtime by shop stewards.

Presence Of Organized Crime "Services" On Job Sites

Though often related to employee kickbacks described above, this practice – to be effective – requires a union to be safely controlled by organized crime: once control is accomplished, "'shylocks," numbers runners and other racketeers can operate with impunity on job sites. Most of the literature dealing with this method of operation focuses on docks, construction sites, and the New York City garment district.

Padding Payrolls With "Ghost" Workers

There are many uses to which "ghost" union members can be put. For example, those engaged in job site criminal services are often put on union rolls to justify their presence on a job site although they do no legitimate work. Another use of "ghost" union members is to collect salaries which may then be used to support union officials, deposed racketeers, or as a source of kickback payments to the employer. For example, the McClellan Committee found that two "ghosts" in the New York City Teamster Local 239 drew salaries for Antonio Corallo, a Cosa Nostra underboss, in 1957.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Also, organization-controlled or "paper locals" with many "ghosts" can be used to bolster the vote totals of selected candidates for union offices: James Hoffa reportedly sought the support of the Dioguardi and Corallo "paper locals" in his quest for power in the 1950's.

Union Business Given To Criminally-Controlled Firms

Unions controlled by or having a close relationship with organized crime often deposit their pension funds and operating accounts in certain banks and hire professionals generally associated with organized crime to manage their affairs (e.g., lawyers, fund brokers, insurance agents, and the like). The Teamster's Union in particular shows a penchant for hiring such persons. There are a number of reports of organized crime figures forming consultant firms to deal with organized labor: union involvement includes the multi-billion-dollar Teamster's Pension Fund for which Allen Dorfman, reputedly a member of the Chicago Syndicate, served as a consultant; the many construction union locals in New Jersey which employed DeCavalcante consultants; and the New York City Teamster locals which have depended upon the consulting services of John Dioguardi.

Use Of Labor "Mediators" Provided By Organized Crime

It is often possible for a business troubled by labor difficulties to buy labor peace with a talk to the "right man." Of course, the possibilities are great that the "labor unrest" was created precisely for the purpose of extracting such an obligation to talk with – and render payments to – the "right man." The "fixes" engineered by John Dioguardi are legion throughout the literature on labor racketeering, and Joe Valachi's testimony suggests how easy it was for Dioguardi to resolve labor disputes.

Arrangement Of "Sweetheart Contracts"

These contracts (so-called "sweetheart" because they are written to benefit employers or unions but not employees) are arranged between a controlled company and a controlled union or between a controlled union and a non-controlled company. The advantages in the first are obvious: wages and benefits kept low to increase the controlled company's profit rate with union officials receiving personal payments for their role.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the second type of situation, the controlled union focuses upon winning closed, union, or agency shop agreements and increased payments to the union's benefit funds, all of which increase the resources available for use by organized crime in return for reducing its demands for benefits directly useful to workers. This arrangement may also involve a fee to "labor consultants."

Loans Between Criminal and Labor Organizations

Depending upon circumstances, this category may not involve an illegal activity, but a pattern of collusion is established. There are examples of these questionable loans flowing in both directions. James Hoffa allegedly borrowed from Mafia sources when financially pressed during his quest for the Teamster presidency and again to pay huge legal bills. There are many instances of projects fronting for or otherwise backed by organized crime which have been funded by Teamster Pension Fund loans, many Las Vegas businesses being prime examples.

Violence and sabotage against competitors, rival unions or employers deserves separate mention as a technique of labor racketeering. Since it deals with tactics rather than purposes, it is intimately related to all the methods of criminal activity discussed in this chapter. It is in the area of violence and sabotage that one clearly sees the mutual assistance organized crime and organized labor can render each other. Organized crime "muscle" is available for the enforcement of union demands against employers as a bargaining tactic, for factional disputes within a union (reformers against entrenched corrupt officials), for inter-union struggles, and for unionized against non-unionized employees who are resisting a take-over (or in a hotly-fought bargaining agent election).

On the other hand, union status can be used to provide an acceptable "cover" for organization "muscle" and the union can be called upon to sabotage the businesses of those that compete with Mafia-controlled firms through violence, destruction or crippling strikes. Recently there have been a number of violent outbreaks among construction workers in the Philadelphia area, Florida and Louisiana to discourage the hiring of non-union labor or to destroy firms that engage in this practice. News reports have tied the Philadelphia construction violence to organized crime figures in New Jersey while the Louisiana shootings have occurred in an area where law enforcement has been controlled by the same family for over 100 years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF JAMES R. HOFFA

One of the more lurid indications of organized criminal infiltration of a major international labor union is seen in the disappearance, apparent abduction, and likely murder of former Teamster president James R. Hoffa.

Hoffa was serving a term in federal prison (for jury tampering and mail fraud) when President Richard Nixon was persuaded to commute the sentence in 1971 conditioned upon Hoffa's agreement that he would not become involved in Teamster Union activities until 1980. It was not long, however, before the former Teamster president began to feel the constraints imposed by the agreement and he quickly initiated a series of maneuvers designed to blunt — and even eliminate — the prohibition against future union activity. While pursuing his objectives on the legal and political fronts, Hoffa also began direct as well as indirect efforts toward rekindling support among Teamsters across the country favoring his return to power. Hoffa was certain of his eventual success in obtaining, through one means or another, freedom to seek anew the power and perquisites he enjoyed in times past.

Support from rank and file is insufficient to attain ultimate political power in the Teamster Union: external groups had become, as Hoffa knew from his own experience in earlier years, too important to be ignored. The union's powerbrokers and their associates had to be courted. Frank Fitzsimmons, a mere conduit for Hoffa's orders while the latter was in prison, had become quite comfortable as president and had moved successfully to break the Hoffa hold by putting his own people in key subordinate positions and by apparently making his own arrangements with the individuals and groups who had been responsible for Hoffa's original rise to power. As a consequence, a rift developed within the union between the Fitzsimmons and Hoffa forces. The dispute, often erupting in bombings, beatings and other instances of violence, became more heated with the passage of time.(1) There is no way of predicting how this contest might have eventually resolved itself. Fitzsimmons had the reins of national power firmly in hand; had constructed smoothly operating contacts with external influence groups; had the very real advantages of incumbency; and, by all accounts, seemed willing, if not especially eager, to oppose the Hoffa resurgence.

On the day of his abduction, July 30, 1975, Hoffa reportedly believed he was to meet with three of the Teamster powerbrokers: Leonard Schultz, a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Detroit union leader; Anthony Provenzana, convicted extortionist, boss of Teamster Joint Council 16 in New York City and also a reputed Mafia "capo"; (2) and Anthony Giacalone, reputedly a Mafia boss in Detroit and involved in a Teamster medical insurance fund scandal in Michigan. (3) With whom Hoffa did meet on that fateful day is the subject of a wide investigation. Nevertheless, his disappearance reduced the challenge to Fitzsimmon's power to faint grumblings among the discontented rank and file. (4)

Four months after the disappearance, three men were viewed in a police lineup by a witness to the abduction and released. The three —Thomas Andretta, Salvatore Briguglio, and Gabriel Briguglio — were associated with the New Jersey Teamster union structure and are also reported to have close connections with organized crime figures. Salvatore Briguglio is reported to be Anthony Provenzano's right-hand man (as business agent) at New Jersey Teamsters Local 560, while his brother Gabriel is the union's strong-arm man. Andretta has been associated with the Hudson County New Jersey mob. Found on the same day were two pistols with silencers in a cabinet at Local 560 headquarters. (5) In the words of United States Attorney Philip Van Dam, there are "no indictments around the corner...." and the probe continues. Their lawyer, William Bufalino, claims all three are innocent. Bufalino, a prominent Teamster attorney, is not unknown in the literature of organized crime: the nephew of Angelo Meli (who has been identified as a labor racketeer in the Detroit "syndicate"), Bufalino has been previously implicated in connection with Mafia jukebox rackets, rackets reportedly developed by some of the biggest mobsters in the Detroit area. (6)

Nor are the individuals questioned in regard to Hoffa's disappearance unknown to those who follow the more questionable aspects of Union affairs. On June 24, 1976, Salvatore Briguglio was indicted for the murder of Anthony Castellito in 1961: Castellito at the time was secretary-treasurer of Teamster Local 560 and the indictment charges that Salvatore Briguglio's "pay" for this job was his appointment as the Local's business agent. Indicted also (on a conspiracy to murder charge) was Anthony Provenzano who allegedly provided an office for the plotters at the union's headquarters in Union City, New Jersey. While federal authorities (who, incidentally, are being coordinated by the Justice Department Strike Force Against Organized Crime) would neither speculate concerning the motive nor suggest any relationship between this crime and the Hoffa disappearance (other than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the obvious overlap of persons questioned on both matters), it is hoped that the Castellito crime charges might pressure others to come forward regarding the more recent Hoffa affair. (7)

GOVERNMENT EFFORTS AGAINST LABOR RACKETEERING

Government efforts against organized crime and labor racketeering are a very mixed affair. The effectiveness of such efforts ranges from cover-up to some very impressive investigations and prosecutions. Quite often, government ineffectuality is a result of organized crime infiltration or influence which, as shall be seen, affects the highest levels of policy-making and regulation

So long as the American political/legal system permits criminal activity to be profitable, it should come as no surprise that the drive to circumvent government efforts against organized crime should be so formidable. This mutual admiration society of organized crime and some portions of organized labor has little to fear from concerted government effort to restrain excessive union power. Indeed the pattern of response by labor racketeering elements is usually one of strategic retreat with a resumption of operations soon after government pressure has been lifted. Only a few are so entrenched and powerful that they are willing to flaunt their operations through these recurring periods of citizen outrage and government investigation.

The Federal effort against organized crime received its inspiration from the Kefauver Crime Committee Hearings of the early 1950's. But it was the McClellan Committee in the mid 1950's that brought the problem of labor racketeering squarely to the attention of the American public. Unfortunately the subject has received little attention from the Federal Government in the years since then. Other investigations of organized crime from that time have barely scratched the surface of labor racketeering although Senator McClellan himself would be the first to admit that his own Committee Hearings were only a beginning.

The McClellan Hearings run to 20,000 pages and over fifty volumes. The volume of the material is dramatic testimony to the extent to which corruption flourished in labor relations within the then-existing legal structure. Modifications in this legal structure which followed the Hearings (principally the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959) imposed some obligations and restraints upon labor unions intended to expose corruption and racketeering but were ineffectual: as this study has noted, criminal penetra-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion has been exposed as much by good journalism as by so-called government regulation. The legislative changes that occurred made little headway in removing those characteristics of the American union movement which make it attractive to organized crime.

Students of American labor racketeering should be tremendously indebted to the McClellan Committee for its investigations. It should be borne in mind, however, that the Hearings were investigations only, *not* trials, and future researchers should exercise care not to allow guilt to flow automatically from allegations. But the Hearings set the stage for good investigative research into the problem.

They are the indispensable foundation for any study on the subject and have inspired a number of excellent books dealing with the problem of organized criminal activities within labor unions, including Robert F. Kennedy's *The Enemy Within*, Sen. John McClellan's *Crime Without Punishment*, Clark R. Mollenhoff's *The Tentacles of Power*, Sylvester Petro's *Power Unlimited: The Corruption of Union Leadership*, Lester Velie's *Labor U.S.A.* and Frederick Sonder's classic *Brotherhood of Evil: The Mafia.* Along with these must be counted hundreds of journal, magazine, and newspaper articles.

Senator MacClellan's work, and activities generated by the hearings undertaken by associated agencies, brought about considerable exposure of labor rackets and labor racketeering in localities across the country. Chicago, Detroit, New York City, Scranton (Pennsylvania), Portland (Oregon), Seattle and Spokane (Washington) are some of the cities where labor unions were found to be infested by organized crime figures. The main targets of the hearings, as it turned out, were the Teamster Union and its International President, James R. Hoffa. This part of the investigation alone revealed to the American public a most dangerous concentration of political and economic power in the hands of organized crime. Aside from Hoffa, the Committee cast light upon the activities of scores of labor racketeers, many of whom (John Dioguardi, Antonio Corallo, Russell Bufalino, and Gerardo Catena, to name a few) had long-noted Mafia affiliations.

In the early sixties, the McClellan Committee continued its probe of Hoffa and the Teamsters. Another area of investigation was the American Guild of Variety Artists, where organized criminal influence was found to be widespread. But the focus of Federal investigations shifted from labor racketeering to the international narcotics traffic after the Joseph Valachi testimony before the Committee in 1963-64. Except for casual references

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to labor racketeering in later crime hearings, which would seem to reinforce the proposition that the subject had not been exhausted, there has since been no major effort by Congress to explore this jungle of labor corruption.

During a 1968 hearing before the House Government Operations Committee, Mr. Stephen Gordon (then Associate General Counsel to the National Labor Relations Board) stated that the board had referred 51 cases of organized criminal activity in various labor unions to the U.S. Justice Department. (8) When contacted by the author in reference to the Gordon testimony, a Deputy to the Associate General Counsel of the Board quickly passed responsibility for answering such inquiries to the Justice Department by asserting the N.L.R.B. had nothing available on the subject of organized crime and American labor unions. He further attempted to discourage the entire investigation by gruffly announcing that the researcher would not find any material pertinent to the matter and that the researcher was looking in the wrong direction.

The Justice Department explained in somewhat less hostile terms that it is impossible to research such a matter as the "51 referrals" of organized criminal labor racketeering alleged in sworn testimony in 1967. Nor was the Department official able to say whether any of the 51 cases had been prosecuted and, if so whether successfully. Materials as well as inquiries on the problem of organized crime and labor unions appear to be subject to an extensive bureaucratic "buck-passing" process among agencies before finally being lost forever in a labyrinth of government documents and red tape. All too often, as the Justice Department admitted, researchers are confronted with truculent dismissals, "benign neglect" or helpless resignation when dealing with federal officials supposedly guarding the public from the abuse of organized criminal labor rackets.

In October, 1975, the Department of Labor reportedly began a long-overdue probe into the Teamster pension funds. (9) In December, Anthony Provenzano and a number of other persons were indicted on charges of arranging fund loans for kickbacks. (10) Whether this probe can be truly effective because of intra-governmental conflict, or whether it will vigorously investigate this explosive subject should be a matter of great concern to the American public.

On balance, Federal efforts against organized crime in the labor relations field have been a qualified failure. Many of the same abuses, many of the same people, scored in the McClellan Hearings have re-emerged. During the 1968 House Government Operations Committee Hearings on the "Federal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Effort Against Organized Crime," it was noted that persons as notorious as John Dioguardi and Antonio Corallo were still powerful forces in the Teamster union. Even incarceration failed to diminish their influence: they simply placed front men in key positions in various locals and, while authorities rested on their laurels, mobster control of these Teamster locals continued. (11) Despite years of Federal investigation, the Westchester Country (New York) garbage industry reportedly remains under tight Mafia control. (12) So does Kennedy Airport, despite having been the object of an intensive congressional hearing. (13) And in Chicago, union rackets thought by some to have died with Al Capone (or at least weakened by the spotlight of the McClellan Committee) still thrive. (14)

Whenever researchers re-examine areas where the government has boasted of cleaning out labor racketeers, it is found that the original rackets have persisted, even expanded, under the same individuals, (or their friends or relatives) and are still tolerated and protected by an unholy combination of public apathy, fear on the part of dissident workers and union members, government apathy and union officials whose efforts are directed to neither the public nor the worker's interests. Even more noteworthy is the fact that responsibility for some of the most effective anti-racketeering efforts cannot be claimed by Washington, with its vast powers and resources, but must be awarded to a few journalists (such as the recently assassinated Don Bolles of Arizona) and local police officials (Colorado Bureau of Investigation Director John MacIvor and his staff, for example) who relentlessly pursue their assaults upon the bastions of organized crime. Judging from the efforts of these individuals and others like them, success against the outrages of labor racketeers requires courage, persistence, a sense of justice coupled with true concern for public welfare and imagination. All the sophisticated techniques, hundreds of agents and unmatched power to work through an uncorrupted judicial structure have proved to be inadequate at the Federal level. Of course, one has no way of measuring frustration experienced by Federal agents who have been unduly restrained in the performance of their duties by politically or personally motivated superiors.

Of the three states showing the most concern for labor racketeering, the Pennsylvania report was perhaps the most direct and forceful. (15) It contains an excellent survey of the methods and structure of organized criminal activity in that state: in particular, the report documents how non-Mafia criminal groups often work together with Mafia families in so far as mutual respect for territorial domains and trading favors is concerned.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irregularities in various Pittsburgh and Philadelphia Teamster locals and in Philadelphia construction locals are spotlighted. Moreover, the report contains a brief chronology of important racketeering investigations and convictions in the state.

The New Jersey material is contained in the reports of the State Commission on Investigations, published annually since 1969. (16) Initially, the Commission was established to lead the battle against the forces of organized crime and Mafia families infesting the state. The Commission's witness immunity policy, which forces reluctant witnesses to testify or face jail, seems to have shaken up the New Jersey Mafia to some extent. Many of the top figures (e.g., Gerardo Catena, Anthony Russo, and Angelo Bruno) have been jailed for contempt: others have fled the state to avoid the painful choice. Unfortunately, experience has shown that the absence or incarceration of a central figure is no indication that the rackets have stopped. Corallo, Dioguardi and Genovese reportedly managed to continue their labor racketeering from behind bars. For those who fled, there is always the telephone. This is not to say that such an immunity policy is entirely ineffective or should be discontinued; indeed, other states might consider its adoption, at least as an indication of an intent to make serious progress. States which adopt and vigorously pursue a witness immunity policy may discover, as did New Jersey, that either new information can be developed through testimony or crime operations can be temporarily disrupted because of the departure of important criminal elements from the scene (jail or flight). While it is not impossible for such persons to continue operations from a distance or through intermediaries, it is known from prior experience that efficiency and centralized control is weakened. States should also weigh carefully the constitutional implications of a witness immunity policy: they must balance the possible damage which some say is done to protected rights against the benefits produced by a possibly significant weapon against organized crime.

On the other hand, the New Jersey State Commission on Investigations has been less successful in its assaults upon labor racketeering as a sub-species of organized crime. In its investigation of the Building Maintenance Service, the Commission found that a Teamster union official and other Teamster associates, together with organized crime figures, had conspired to restrict competition in that field. (17) As a result, the Federal Justice Department obtained anti-trust indictments against twelve firms and five individuals connected with this business field in 1974. The same investigation revealed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "labor peace" could be obtained by grocery stores in exchange for stocking certain cleaning products. There is no report, however, of any federal action against Mafia-Teamster ties utilizing any one of several labor racketeering statutes already on the books.

The report also notes that organized criminals prefer to infiltrate pension funds in unions where the majority of members will never collect from the fund. These include construction, trucking, bartending and other unions with a high turnover in personnel.

CONCLUSIONS

The picture which emerges from this study of organized crime and the American labor movement is not a pretty one. There is evidence that one of the nation's largest unions has been infiltrated by organized racketeers and that other unions of strategic political and economic importance to American society have become corrupted by the influence of organized crime.

The ultimate challenge of labor racketeering, however, is to the millions of union members whose economic well-being is constantly being eroded by racket inroads into their pensions and other insurance benefits; it is a challenge to the American public forced to pay higher prices by racket-induced business monopolies engineered through crime-controlled union locals; it is a challenge to supporters of responsible unionism who must devise and actively work for reforms designed to correct those aspects of contemporary unions which make them susceptible to organized crime; it is a challenge to the AFL-CIO whose tough resolutions on union ethics (developed in 1957 under pressure from the results of the McClellan Hearings) are honored only by a conspiracy of silence; it is a challenge to honest unions and locals which, finding themselves tarred with a Mafia brush by association, suffer an understandable resistance from employers and the non-unionized; and it is a challenge to our legal system to keep us free from violence, coercion and fear.

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Feuding Teamsters," *Newsweek* (August 4, 1975).

(2) *New York Times* (December 6, 1975), 18:3.

(3) "Jimmy Hoffa Vanishes," *Newsweek* (August 11, 1975); also, "The Teamsters and the Mob," *Newsweek* (August 18, 1975).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4) *Wall Street Journal* (January 20, 1976), 1:6; also, *Washington Post* (May 28, 1976), 1:4.

(5) *New York Times* (December 1, 1975), 1:1; (December 5, 1975), 18:3; (December 7, 1975), 42:1.

(6) Clark R. Mollenhoff, *The Tentacles of Power* (1965); also Robert F. Kennedy, *The Enemy Within* (1960).

(7) *New York Times* (June 24, 1976), pp. 1, 44-1.

(8) House Government Operations Committee, "Hearings on the Federal Effort Against Organized Crime," September, 1968, Testimony of Stephen Gordon (Associate General Counsel to the N.L.R.B.).

(9) *New York Times* (October 17, 1975), 32:1.

(10) *New York Times* (December 11, 1975). 38:3.

(11) U.S. House, Government Operations Committee, "Hearings on the Federal Effort Against Organized Crime" (1968, Testimony of Frank M. Kleiler); *Wall Street Journal* (August 11, 1968).

(12) *New York Times* (October 13, 1974), 1:1.

(13) *New York Times* (November 10, 1974), 131:3.

(14) Ovid Demaris, *Captive City* (1969).

(15) Pennsylvania Crime Commission, *Report on Organized Crime* (1970).

(16) New Jersey State Commission on Investigations, *Annual Reports* (1969 through 1974).

(17) *New Jersey State Crime Investigations Annual Report* (1970).

We acknowledge with gratitude the permission of the Foundation for the Advancement of the Public Trust to publish this special version of their recent study.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW

A journal of scholarship and opinion publishing articles in the fields of philosophy, political science, economics, literature and social criticism. THE INTERCOLLEGIATE REVIEW is made available free of charge to faculty and students four times during the academic year by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute. Subscriptions are invited from those outside the academic community: one year, five dollars; two years, nine dollars; three years, twelve dollars. Subscriptions and inquiries should be addressed to: ISI, 14 South Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010.

Contributors to recent issues:

Hanson Baldwin
Louis I. Bredvold
Yale Brozen
George Carey
John Davenport
Henry Hazlitt
Will Herberg
Russell Kirk
Thomas Molnar
Gerhart Niemeyer
Robert Nisbet
Peter Stanlis
Frank N. Trager
Stephen Tonsor
Eliseo Vivas
Robert Penn Warren
Francis G. Wilson
Donald Atwell Zoll

Contributors to previous issues:

Raymond Aron
William Bark
Karl Brandt
Colin Clark
Donald Davidson
M. Stanton Evans
Lawrence H. Gipson
Otto von Habsburg
Arthur Kemp
Willmoore Kendall
William R. Kintner
Ludwig von Mises
Leo Strauss
Robert Strausz-Hupé
Richard M. Weaver
Simon N. Whitney
Frederick Wilhelmsen
David McCord Wright

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPANISH POLITICAL SCENE

Samuel T. Francis

On November 20, 1975, General Francisco Franco died in Madrid. The passing of *El Caudillo* marked the end of an important era in 20th Century history, but it raised ominous questions for the country he had ruled since 1939. In 1969, Franco had designated Prince Juan Carlos de Bourbon as his heir and had decreed the restoration of the Spanish monarchy following his death. Juan Carlos is the grandson of King Alfonso XIII, who was deposed with the establishment of the Republic in 1931. Two days after Franco's death, the Prince was installed as King Juan Carlos I. He quickly embarked on a process of liberalization that, though sometimes checked, does not yet seem to have ended.

The freeing of 1,600 political prisoners, the granting of the right of assembly, the legalization of labor unions and strikes, the loosening of controls over the press and political expression, the legalization of opposition parties (including the Communist Party of Spain, or PCE, on April 9 1977) are aspects of the "progressive" reforms that have occurred in Spain since Franco's death. The King retained Carlos Arias Navarro, appointed by Franco, as Premier. But, in July, 1976, Arias resigned on the request of the King, and Juan Carlos appointed Adolfo Suarez Gonzalez, generally represented as a "Centrist", who at present retains office. On December 15, 1976, in a referendum approved by the unicameral Francoist Cortes (Parliament), 76 per cent of the eligible Spanish electorate voted to approve by 94 per cent a largely democratic constitution which establishes a bicameral Parliament responsible to the King. It is under this constitution, expected to be revised shortly, that the June 15 elections were authorized and held.

Not everyone in Spain was pleased with this process of liberalization. A stable political democracy has never existed in Spanish history, although in the time of the Celts and the Visigoths the peninsula shared the traditional European political system of a monarchy advised by a Council of Nobles, whose decisions were periodically referred to an Assembly of the Freemen. Both the right and the left have criticized the new constitutional and polit-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ical developments. Other groups, including regional separatists in Catalonia, the Basque provinces, and the Canary Islands; anarchists and Maoists; and right-wing Catholic organizations, have resorted to different degrees of terrorism, ranging from beatings to kidnappings, bombings, and murder.

About 6,000 candidates representing some 160 legally recognized parties, contended for the 557 elective seats in the Parliamentary campaign, which began on May 24. There are several groupings – probably not parties in the Western sense – that command more support than most. So far, issues seem to play a minor role in Spanish politics. Campaigning revolved more around personalities and symbols from the Spanish past – relationships with Franco, in the Civil War, and to ideological posturing – than around a serious public discussion of national issues. The leading groups may be classified as Left, Right and Center, with more extreme groups bordering each wing.

The leading left-wing group in Spain is currently the *Socialist Worker's Party* (PSOE) led by Felipe Gonzalez 34, a lawyer from Seville. The PSOE is the mainstream socialist party, founded in 1879 and affiliated with the Socialist International. Gonzalez is a young man who never wears a tie in public and has boasted that no-one is to the left of him. He originally voiced a favorable attitude to the Communists, but has since backed off, due to pressure from other European socialist parties, such as the West German SDP. The SDP has financially supported the PSOE with $20 million, as has Venezuelan President Carlos Andres Perez with about $6 million last year. Gonzalez has also called for the termination of U.S. bases in Spain.

Another left-wing alliance is the Federation of Socialist Parties(PSP), which began as a university group and still retains an academic tinge. The economist, Tierno Galvan, leads this party. Its popularity since the early 1970's has dimmed somewhat, due to its tendency to characterize Spain as a Third World country and to its connection with exiled Saharans and with pro-Arab forces, as a result of which it has been associated with anti-Israeli and anti-Zionist views.

To the right of these groups is an anti-Communist social-democratic alliance composed of three organizations: the Federation of Social Democratic Socialist Party, and the Social Reform Party. These also tend to have academic leadership; prominent are Professors Lasuen and Arrarte (economists) and Antonio Garcia Lopez, an anti-Communist. Garcia is a lawyer from Madrid who is said to have the support of high military officers, but less support at the grass roots level.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Spanish left seems to be divided by various persuasions of socialist ideology and by an ambivalent attitude towards Communism. On the one hand, the democratic left favors Communist participation in politics as a test of freedom. But, at the same time, because it is more moderate, it has a latent fear and distrust of the Communists. Thus, it is largely hesitant to exclude the PCE from politics but is also hesitant to allow them a role. Felipe Gonzalez was recently quoted on this issue: "The Communists have never yet respected the rules of democracy when in power. But it is unrealistic to try to exclude them from politics."(1)

If the Left becomes part of a coalition with Suarez, their ambivalence may disarm them in the event of a serious confrontation with the Communists.

The largest right-wing organization is the *Alianza Popular* (AP), a coalition of former supporters of Franco who now support the democratic constitution. The leader of the AP is Manuel Frago Iribarne, 54, former Minister of Interior and Information, who advocated liberalization under Franco. Other prominent leaders of the AP are Gonzalo Fernandez de la Mora, Minister of Public Works and builder of the modern Spanish highways, as well as a prominent political theorist; Laureano Lopez Rodo, Minister of Finance in the 1960's when Spain made significant economic progress; and Carlos Arias Navarro, former Premier under Franco and Juan Carlos. The AP has received support from Franz Josef Strauss's Bavarian party and has sought support from other European conservative parties. In addition to the AP, there are at least three other right-wing groups of minor importance: the *Fuerza Nueva* of Blas Pinar, the National Alliance of Antonio Giron, and the *Hermandad de Alfereces Provisionales*. These are Falangist in orientation.

The main group on the Center is the Democratic Center Union(UCD), a coalition of about fifteen centrist organizations. This is the group of Premier Suarez, and has combined with the Popular Party of Jose Maria de Areilza. Areilza is a former ambassador to the U.S. and served as Juan Carlos' first foreign minister. Another leading centrist group is the Christian Democratic Alliance. It consists of Joaquin Ruiz Jimenez, of the Democratic Left, and the conservative Popular Democratic Federation and other groups. Jimenez, refusing to join the UCD because of the latter's alleged Francoist leanings, has allied himself with the PSOE.

Suarez was widely expected to win the election, at least to the extent of being able to form a coalition government with the runners-up. One reason for this is his personal popularity, but also it is to be remembered that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government-run election gave him an advantage. Only Suarez could use Spanish television to announce his candidacy, and the rural bias of the electoral system gives him (and the Conservatives) an edge. Suarez is probably further to the left than he has so far appeared. He seems to value political realism and "pragmatism" above ideology. Of the Center and Right in general, it can be said that their candidates display an impressive range of talent and experience. However, many do not appear to possess the ability or experience to cope effectively with the techniques and rhetoric of democracy, and it is questionable whether they will have much future on the electoral scene unless they can learn these skills quickly.

In addition to the fascist, Falangist, and Francoist groups, more extreme right and left wing organizations such as the Carlists, the ETA (Basque Homeland and Liberty), the Warriors of Christ the King, the Kamikaze Commandos and others have held public attention , if not power, in Spain until recently. They were not expected to gain much support in the election.

The Communist Party of Spain (PCE) was illegal in Spain from the beginning of the Franco regime until April 9, 1977. Its current leader is Santiago Carillo, 61, who was governor of Madrid in the Civil War when 12,000 Nationalist prisoners of war were murdered by the Republican troops. Its senior figure is Dolores Ibarruri, who has long been a Stalinist and a resident of the Soviet Union until her recent return to Spain. Ibarruri, nicknamed "La Pasionaria', has been accused of involvement in the murder of conservative leader Calvo Sotelo in the days prior to the Civil War. Despite its association with atrocities and extremism, the PCE now claims to be a democratic movement, part of the allegedly reformed "Eurocommunist" movement in France and Italy. However, Carillo's recent book, *Eurocommunism and the State*, advocates a highly centralized and ideologized regime that would use political forces to transform Spanish society. Carillo's heir apparent is a well-known economist, Ramon Tamames, 43.

The PCE has reportedly received considerable aid from the KGB, which has infiltrated other leftist organizations and much of the media. However, Moscow has not overtly supported the PCE, perhaps because it distrusts the Party's independence, and has tried to create another Communist structure in Spain. According to Spanish intelligence, the KGB provided 1.5 billion pesetas (about $22.5 million) last year for the PCE. Also, several top level officers of the KGB have been identified in Spain: Viktor Lessiovsky, Yuri Ponomarev, Viktor Filipov, Alekei Osipov, Anatoly Krasikov, Vladimir Pertsov. The KGB has made overtures to the PSOE and given covert aid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to MPAIAC, a Canary Island guerrilla group as well as to the mainland separatists movements. Rumania also reportedly gives covert training to PCE members in terrorist and guerrilla techniques.

The object of the Soviet Communists is revealed in the "Oran Plan", which came to light in 1974. The goals of this plan were to overthrow the governments of Spain, Morocco, and Portugal, and to achieve Soviet control of the Western Mediterranean and West African coast. KGB activities in Spain, aside from aid and training for its allies, have consisted of penetration of the Spanish media, the use of sports events and religious gatherings as political actions, and the manipulation of other social activities to subvert and propagandize Spanish society. This covert Soviet intervention is probably the greatest internal problem that a new government has to face.

In the face of this type of aid from the Kremlin, the PCE cannot credibly claim that it has turned its back on the Soviet "style" of Communism. Nor can the Communists be regarded as loyal to the non-Communist government of Spain.

On June 15, about 80 percent of Spain's 23.5 million eligible voters went to the polls. The result was a fairly strong victory for the center and moderate left and a rebuff for the Communists and the right. The following table shows the results for the major winners.

PARTY	% OF POPULAR VOTE	SEATS IN CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES	SEATS IN SENATE
UCD	34.0%	165	105
PSOE	18.5%	119	60
PCE	9.0%	20	8
AP	8.2%	17	

At the close of the polling, King Juan Carlos named 41 centrist Senators to fill the appointive seats in the upper house. The political fortunes of the leading candidates are also revealing. Suarez, Carillo, Ibarruri, and Gonzalez were all elected, but two leading rightists — Arias Navarro and Blas Pinar, were defeated.

If it is possible to infer trends in Spanish political culture from these results, one can say that the Spanish electorate feels very little nostalgia for the Franco years but that it equally rejects the Communist alternative, despite Carillo's efforts to refurbish his image; and that the electorate is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attracted to the center-left policies of increasing liberalization, economic distribution, and modernization.

These results point to a coalition of the center and left under Suarez and Gonzalez. The latter, however, whose party would profit from a more urban-oriented electoral system, has indicated that he looks on a coalition with the center unfavorably and has already called for a quick drafting of a new constitution and for new elections. Whether such a coalition would provide a stable government, given the political ambitions of its likely leaders, may well be doubted.

Governmental stability appears problematical also when one considers the problems the government must face. In addition to the infiltration of the KGB (and other foreign forces) discussed above, Spain has severe economic problems that only a very strong and stable government can deal with: 30 percent annual inflation, 8 percent unemployment, a balance of payments deficit of $4.24 billion last year, a fall in its foreign reserves of $900 million, a foreign debt of $12 billion and a chronic flight of capital. Such problems call for austerity, but the recently legalized labor unions are unlikely to accept such measures passively. Their Communist and Socialist leaders will not ignore the political opportunities presented by the economy and a divided ministry.

The predominantly right-wing military forces of Spain, on the other hand, will probably be reluctant to permit a left-wing takeover. The military forces consist of 314,000 men (47,400 officers; 267,000 NCO's and privates). The army consists of 220,000 men and has played a major role in the preservation of internal order. This role has been supplemented by the three police forces: the General Police Corps, 10,000 men plus employees and informers; the Civil Guard, 63,000; and the riot police, 34,000. A military coup cannot be discounted, especially since the election returns do not point toward the possibility of either a right-wing democratic victory or even a stable centrist government. Since the armed forces also contain some liberal units observers consider civil war remotely possible. The government seriously feared a widespread reaction in the wake of its recent legalization of the PCE. For this reason, it announced the action without warning the day before Easter, when most Spaniards were dispersed on vacation. If Suarez should attempt to reform or scale down the police and army, as he has announced he will, this threat to their long-established power could also alienate many officers.

Finally, all these problems must be seen in the light of the general

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural transformation as Spain becomes increasingly industrialized and urbanized. Demands for a regional autonomy, for economic integration into the EEC and military-political acceptance into NATO, for social liberalization (divorce, abortion, women's rights), and for economic innovations (wage increases, new housing, labor demands) could create a "revolution of rising expectations" that would overlap more insidious appetites for power. The Communist Party's Central Committee has issued a communique to its leading activists which, among other things, calls attention to the political uses of the highly popular and newly tolerated pornography in Spanish newstands:

> The tolerance toward sex that is practised by government oligarchy is much to our advantage. Many of our newly affiliated youngsters have confessed that they were first attracted by pornography. *

In conclusion, then, we may say that the political structure of Spain is precarious. Despite the "success" of the election itself, a pre-election poll showed that only 26 percent of the Spanish people knew what they would be voting for. The results of the elections promise to be unstable, and it is not clear that the new government will even be strong enough to endure, let alone seriously try to resolve, conflicting forces now disturbing the Spanish scene.

* Quoted in *National Review*, June 10, 1977, p. 665.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANNOUNCING

A NEW QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Policy Review

A Publication of The Heritage Foundation, Washington, DC

Policy Review will stimulate and provoke with timely and thoughtful critiques of present foreign and domestic policies.

The inaugural issue (Summer 1977) will include articles by *Robert Moss* (editor of *The Economist's Foreign Report*) on Eurocommunism after the Spanish elections; *Kenneth W. Clarkson* and *Roger E. Meiners* (Center for Law and Economics, University of Miami) on how the food stamp work registration requirement has added 2 points to the unemployment rate; *Peter Bauer* (London School of Economics) and *John O'Sullivan* (*Daily Telegraph* of London) on how foreign aid works to make the world poorer; plus articles on the new foreign policy elite, on social security reform and preview selections from the forthcoming *US Strategy in the Decade Ahead* including chapters by *Robert Conquest* (Hoover Institution), *Colin Gray* (Hudson Institute) and others.

The second issue (Fall 1977) will include articles by: *Winston S. Churchill, II* (Shadow Minister of Defense) on the weakening of NATO's defenses; *Walter Williams* (Economics Department, Temple University) on how the minimum wage law has increased youth and minority unemployment and *Saul Levine* (Director, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission) analyzing the Naderite arguments against nuclear power.

Publisher: Edwin J. Feulner, Jr. *Editor:* Robert L. Schuettinger

The Editorial Board includes (Chairman) David I. Meiselman, Stephen Haseler, Allan H. Meltzer, Robert Moss, Roger Pearson, William Schneider, Gordon Tullock, Ernest van den Haag, and others.

Introductory issue: $2.00. Yearly subscription: $12 for one year, $21 for two years and $30 for three years. *Policy Review*, 513 C St., NE, Washington, DC, 20002.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD POPULATION GROWTH

By Robert S. McNamara
President of the World Bank

Short of thermonuclear war itself, population growth is the gravest issue the world faces over the decades immediately ahead.

Indeed, in many ways rampant population growth is an even more dangerous and subtle threat to the world than thermonuclear war, for it is intrinsically less subject to rational safeguards, and less amenable to organized control.

The population growth of the planet is not in the exclusive control of a few governments, but rather in the hands of literally hundreds of millions of individual parents who will ultimately determine the outcome.

That is what makes the population threat – even more than the nuclear threat – diffuse and intractable. And that is why it must be faced – like the nuclear threat – for what it inevitably is: both a central determinant of mankind's future, and one requiring far more attention of the world community than it is presently receiving.

Last year the world's total population passed the four billion mark. On the face of it, the event was not very dramatic. It marked, of course, the largest number of human beings ever to have been alive simultaneously on the planet – and thus was a record of sorts. But that particular record is broken every year. And will continue to be broken every year long beyond the life span of anyone alive today.

Barring a holocaust brought on by man or nature, the world's population tonight – as we sit here – is the smallest it will be ever again.

How did it reach a population of four billion?

For the first 99 per cent of man's existence, surprisingly slowly. For the last 1 per cent of his history, in a great rush.

At the current global growth rate of about 2 per cent, the world's population will add a fifth billion in about 11 years.

But these global totals, of course, obscure wide demographic differences between the developed and developing countries....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From 1750 to 1850 the developed countries grew annually by 1.5 million people and the developing countries by 3 million; from 1850 to 1950, by 5 million and 7 million, respectively; and from 1950 to 1975, by 11 million and 48 million.

It now appears that a significant decline in fertility may have at last begun in the developing countries. The data are not yet fully conclusive, but the indications are that the crude birth rates have fallen over the past two decades by an average of about 6 points, or nearly 13 per cent (the crude birth rate is the number of live births a year, for every 1,000 of population).

By major region, the decline has been 6.5 points in Asia; 5.4 points in Latin America; and 2.3 points in Africa.

Further, the decline appears to have been general and widespread. It has occurred in 77 of the 88 countries for which estimates are available.

If these indications are confirmed by the censuses scheduled for 1980, then what we are seeing here is something of historic importance. It would mean that the period of rapid acceleration in the rate of growth of the world's population has finally reached its peak and is now definitely moving downward toward stabilization.

But, as welcome as this is, the fact remains that the current rate of decline in fertility in the developing countries is too slow to avoid their ultimately arriving at stationary populations far in excess of acceptable levels. (A stationary population is one that for a long time has had a constant replacement-level fertility, and therefore also has a growth rate equal to zero and a constant age composition.)

Unless governments, through appropriate policy action, can accelerate the reduction in fertility, the global population may not stabilize below 11 billion. That would be a world none of us would want to live in.

But governments can take action, and can accelerate the process, given the resolve and determination to do so.

The critical point is this: for every decade of delay in achieving a net reproduction rate of 1.0 – replacement-level fertility – the ultimate steady-state world population will be approximately 15 per cent greater (see table).

Governments, then, must avoid the severe penalties of procrastination, and try to hasten the process forward.

But how?

The causes and determinants of fertility reduction are extremely complex, but it appears likely that there are a number of key linkages between that reduction and certain specific elements of socio-economic development.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ultimate size of stationary population (1) in selected developing countries
(In millions)

Country	Pop. 1975	Ultimate stationary population: NRR (2) of 1.0 achieved in Yr. 2000	Ultimate stationary population: NRR of 1.0 achieved in Yr. 2020	Percentage increase caused by two decades of delay
India	**620**	**1,400**	**2,000**	**43**
Brazil	**110**	**275**	**390**	**42**
Bangladesh	**76**	**245**	**400**	**63**
Nigeria	**65**	**200**	**320**	**60**

Source: Tomas Freika, *The Future of Population Growth: Alternative Paths to Equilibrium*, Population Council, New York, 1973.
(1) The stationary population level will be reached about 70 years after the date on which a NRR of 1.0 is realized.
(2) Net reproduction rate: the number of daughters a woman would have, under prevailing fertility and mortality patterns, who would survive to the mean age of childbearing.

The factors that appear to be the most important are health, education, broadly distributed economic growth, urbanization, and the enhanced status of women.

These factors are at work in the developing world today, but their progress is too slow to be fully effective.

Without additional intervention on the part of governments, the current population in the developing world is going to continue to grow at rates very substantially in excess of those that would permit far more economic and social progress.

There are two broad categories of interventions that governments must undertake: those designed to encourage couples to desire smaller families; and those designed to provide parents with the means to implement that desire.

To satisfy the demand for a change in family norms, governments and the international community should

Provide a broad choice of the present contraceptive techniques and services to parents.

Improve the delivery systems by which parents can get the services they wish.

And expand present levels of research seeking better techniques and services.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recent studies confirm that the effect of family planning programs is greatest when they are joined to efforts designed to promote related social goals.

We know that eventually the world's population will have to stop growing. That is certain.

What is uncertain is how. And when. At what level. And with what result.

We who are alive today can determine the answers to those questions. By our action — or inaction — we will shape the world for all generations to come.

We can avoid a world of 11 billion and all the misery that such an impoverished and crowded planet would imply. But we cannot avoid it by continuing into the next quarter century the ineffective approach to the problem of population that has characterized the past twenty-five years.

Man is still young in cosmic terms.

He has been on earth for a million years or so. And our modern ancestor, *Homo sapiens*, for a hundred thousand years.

But the universe of which he is a part is some twenty billion years old.

And if we represent the history of the universe by a line a mile long, then modern man has appeared on that line for only a fraction of an inch.

In that time perspective, he is recent, and tentative, and perhaps even experimental. He makes mistakes. And, yet, if he is truly *sapiens* — thinking and wise — then surely there is promise for him.

Problems, yes. But very great promise — if we will but act.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET-CUBAN OFFENSIVE IN AFRICA

Walter Darnell Jacobs

One African expert recently described this as "the darkest hour in Africa's history." Another has said that the African continent is "being ground up and destroyed" and that it may well revert to bush. One of America's most prominent security experts is reported to have said," the locomotive of history is rolling (over southern Africa) and it will soon roll over us (the West)." All these are quotes from persons active in government service in the United States or Africa.

What is happening that has made these highly placed officials so pessimistic about Africa? Undoubtedly it is the success of the Soviet-Cuban thrust into Africa – the uninterrupted series of victories for the communist side and an almost equally regular series of Western reverses. The Soviets have established themselves strongly in the Horn of Africa, in Mozambique, in Angola, in Guinea, and elsewhere. They seem to have the initiative in Rhodesia, South West Africa, and South Africa.

There is little in the nature of communism as it is practiced in Cuba, in the U.S.S.R., or elsewhere that would appear to be attractive to Africa's masses. As an ideology, Marxism-Leninism is proletarian-based and calls for the destruction of the family, religion, and tribal heritage. As an economic or developmental scheme, communism has consistently failed to transform lesser developed countries into developed countries.

The attraction of communism, or of Soviet great power politics in Africa, or of Cuban military and technical intervention there is its efficacy as a technique for the seizure.

This, of course, is what communism has been from the beginning. Lenin had a technique for the seizure of power in Russia in 1917; he had no plans for the organization or development of the post-Putsch country.

Since Lenin's time the technique has varied. It has been refined and suited to the situation, the terrain, and the historical period. In the years since World War II the technique has depended on variations of the guerrilla war device coupled with a relentless psychological offensive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mao Tse-tung had a peasant-based theory which provided success in China. Che Guevara and Fidel Castro used another version of peasant warfare with a high dependance on psychological operations. Regis Debray suggests other variations and Carlos Marighella went, unsuccessfully, to urban guerrilla warfare in Brazil. Vo Nguyen Giap combined rural terrorism with regular warfare – supported by a world wide psychological offensive of impressive proportions – to win in Vietnam. Kwame Nkrumah put forth a combined African form of revolutionary warfare.

All these predecessors provide some lessons of value to the terrorists now assaulting Rhodesia, which country has become a key target for Soviet policy in Central Africa. Robert Gabriel Mugabe, Joshua Mqabuko Nyongolo Nkomo, Ndabaningi Sithole, and others have their own versions of how to fight the war.

The Patriotic Front, consisting of Mugabe's ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union) and Nkomo's ZAPU (Zimbabwe African Peoples Union) has adapted the communist technique for the seizure of power to Rhodesia. The adaptation depends very markedly on Soviet material and political support and, possibly in the future, on Cuban support.

First, the target must be isolated. This has been accomplished. Rhodesia's enemies are united against her. Even her friends insist that the Rhodesians must change their system because it is evil. The government is habitually referred to, in both the West and the East, as an "illegal white minority rule." The first task of war against Rhodesia in order to seize power by force and violence is successfully concluded – although, of course, the psychological offensive will continue and will be intensified.

Second, the infrastructure of Rhodesia – its traditional tribal system of rule and the intricate system of local administration – must be destroyed. This is the task now being undertaken by the Patriotic Front and other terrorist organizations. In rough military terms Rhodesia is now defending four fronts, the northeast which borders Zambia on the Zambesi river and Mozambique (Operation Hurricane), the east which borders Mozambique (Operation Thrasher), the southeast which borders Mozambique, South Africa, and Botswana (Operation Repulse), and the southwest (Operation Tangent).

Rhodesia's neighbors Zambia, Botswana, and especially Mozambique serve as base areas for the training and supply of terrorists who are sent into Rhodesia with the mission of destroying the infrastructure. They attempt to do this by acts of terrorism in villages against chiefs and headmen

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and by indiscriminate mutilation, murder, rape, arson, and ambush. They also attempt to persuade the local blacks not to accept Rhodesian administrative practices such as the dipping of cattle against rinderpest and other diseases or contour plowing to protect the lands against erosion and soil loss. They encourage the destructive farming practice of overgrazing by cattle herds and the running of herds communally so that these herds are now destroying large areas of good farm land in one of the world's great ecological disasters.

The sowing of land mines, which cannot discriminate between white and black, is a basic terrorist tactic. This has resulted in the Rhodesian Army becoming the most efficient anti-mine warfare organization in the world today. But the practice continues and people are still being killed as, for instance, a black nurse on a mercy mission.

The terrorists have been responsible for the massacre of nuns and priests and for the kidnapping of children from schools. These techniques seem to be designed to show that the government cannot protect all areas, as indeed it cannot.

Such practices have not brought the condemnation of the world on the Soviet-sponsored terrorists. This situation undoubtedly results from the efficiency of the Soviet psychological and political campaign in support of Mugabe and Nkomo.

The visit of Castro to Africa and the simultaneous visit of Nikolai V. Podgorny, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., also indicate that support to the terrorist will not decrease but will accelerate. The unloading of massive military supporting supplies in the Mozambique port of Nacala is evidence of this acceleration. Further evidence is provided in the Soviet-Mozambique agreeement for increased Soviet support of Samora Machel's underwriting of terrorism in Rhodesia.

Still further evidence of Soviet intervention to push for a favorable solution in Africa is manifest in the thrust from Angola into Zaire. This push has apparently not succeeded in doing much more than putting several irregulars into Shaba province. Militarily, the invasion was not very awesome but the reaction of the West to the invasion was. The United States failed to do more than expedite deliveries of non-military supplies (already destined for Zaire) and to send more Coca-Cola. The Soviet Union has come off without psychological damage and with some advantages, such as that of convincing Africans from the Mediterranean to the Cape that they plan new victories on the continent. In the West, only France improved its situation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All is not going so smoothly for the Patriotic Front as the above might suggest. Nkomo and Mugabe are an odd couple for an alliance (although, to be sure, history has seen even stranger bedfellows). Already there are indications of struggle between them against the day when "majority rule" comes to Zimbabwe. Either of them would like to be the number one man at that time. Mugabe now has the greater force available. These are chiefly Shona-speaking peoples. Nkomo's force is smaller and chiefly from Matabeland but his position, as an old man deserving respect in the African tradition, is probably stronger. Nkomo has been recruiting for his force by kidnapping school children. This tactic is designed to give Nkomo enough troops so that he will be able to fight successfully against Mugabe after "liberation." The prospect of a wide-ranging civil war between Matabeles and Shona-speaking people in Zimbabwe is real. Already forces representing Nkomo and Mugabe have clashed on Rhodesian territory with minor casualties.

In summary, the Soviet-Cuban assault on Central Africa depends on psychological-political operations throughout the world, and inside Africa. This activity is coordinated with terrorism designed to destroy the existing tribal infrastructure and governmental services. The economic bankruptcy of countries resisting communism and the inability of governments to deal with terrorism could provide a victory for the Soviet-Cuban forces. Orchestration of their efforts requires the coordination of terrorism, economic warfare and psychological and propaganda efforts.

Henry Kissinger has departed from the public scene for a while but his program for the settlement of the Rhodesian question was the great mover and still influences current Anglo-American initiatives. It is true that Dr. David Owen, the British Foreign Secretary, has refined the Kissinger proposals somewhat during his April 1977 visit to Africa. Nevertheless, an understanding of what the West is suggesting can come only from a quick reexamination of what Kissinger proposed and what happened in Africa and especially in Rhodesia as a result.

In 1976 Kissinger called for majority rule in Rhodesia. He did not define majority rule and it has still not been defined. Does it mean simply black rule in Rhodesia?

If so, does it mean joint Matabele-Mashona rule? If it means that, war between the Nkomo and Mugabe factions can hardly be far behind. If it means rule by one major (but not majority) black group then genocide of the groups out of power would likely follow. Majority rule, in short,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a rather amorphous concept even today.

Kissinger's other proposals were follow-ons: No U.S. support for the Smith government at any stage, strict observance of UN mandatory sanctions, communication of the Kissinger program to Salisbury, and advice to American citizens not to travel in Rhodesia and advice to those living there to get out. There were other provisions: the U.S. would help Mozambique because it had closed its border with Rhodesia, the U.S. would provide funds to other states who imitated Mozambique and closed their borders with Rhodesia, relief would be provided to refugees from Rhodesia, promises of aid to the post-Smith government, and protection for minority rights.

The so-called Front-Line Presidents (Sir Seretse Khama of Botswana, Dr. Antonio Agostinho Neto of Angola, Samora Moises Machel of Mozambique, Julius Kambarage Nyerere of Tanzania, and Kenneth David Kaunda of Zambia) immediately rejected the Kissinger program. (At least two of the "front-line" countries – Angola and Tanzania – are not on the front lines – but no one seemed to object to their primary role in determining the future of Rhodesia.)

For his part, Ian Smith accepted the entire Kissinger package including majority rule within two years. This must be one of the most dramatic actions in African politics in our time. Smith's acceptance was conditional on three points: first, there would be an immediate cessation of terrorism, second, the lifting of sanctions, and third, financial aid to Rhodesia. Smith was assured by Kissinger that all these conditions would be fulfilled. Kissinger also led Smith to believe that the front-line presidents had accepted all provisions and conditions. In fact, they had not and almost immediately stated that the package was unacceptable.

Nevertheless, a conference of interested Rhodesian parties followed in Geneva. It proved abortive because of the Mugabe demand for immediate transfer of power to the Patriotic Front.

It was in the midst of the resulting impasse that Owen made his five-nation (not including Rhodesia) safari to Africa. He met Smith and Vorster in Cape Town. He then came up with a three-part program which was straight-away supported by the U.S. Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance.

The Anglo-American initiative envisions: 1) continuation of current diplomatic activities with the aim of getting all parties to a new conference after intensive preparation at committee levels, 2) the conference to decide questions of the franchise, independence date, future White representation through the first post-independence parliament, and a plan to end the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terrorist war and to absorb the terrorists (or guerrillas or freedom fighters, as one will) into the life of the country, and 3) provision for an electoral process with the government to be turned over to the party winning the independence election under a constitution guaranteed by the United States and Great Britain.

The shortcomings of the Owen-Vance proposal are clear. If the black leaders do not cooperate fully, or if they demand immediate unverified rule by one or another group (e. g., the Patriotic Front), the conference will fail. As a minimum, the British and American governments should deplore the continuation of terrorist warfare while the negotiations are in progress. There is no evidence that either Vance or Owen, purported supporters of a peaceful solution in Rhodesia, are willing to do this.

Also involved is Vance's insistence that "nationalist" movement leaders be included in any negotiations. In spite of the continuation of terrorist war, Smith has repeatedly dealt with "nationalist" leaders. He had lengthy negotiations with Nkomo inside Rhodesia. He dealt not only with Nkomo but also with Mugabe and other "nationalist" leaders at the Geneva conference. And he has repeated his willingness to negotiate with any Black leader who demonstrates support inside the country.

The problem, of course, is to determine who the supported Black leaders are. In addition to the Patriotic Front of Mugabe and Nkomo there are a number of other groups who claim to represent Black members of the population. These include: 1) Bishop Abel Tendeyaki Muzorewa's United African National Council [the UANC rejected the Kissinger package], 2) Sithole's faction of the ANC which claims to represent the "true ZANU" but which has been inactive lately, 3) Nkomo's faction of the ANC, 4) Mugabe's Zimbabwe Peoples Army, and 5) Senator Chief Chirau's Zimbabwe United Peoples Organization. Of these only Muzorewa's UANC and Chief Chirau's ZUPO can be said to have demonstrated any popular support, however small, inside Rhodesia. The others are based on recruitment through terrorism and transfer of power through violence and bloodshed.

With the exception of Chief Chirau, these are the leaders of "nationalist movements" that Vance insists should be included in negotiations by Smith. Smith insists that their bona fides to negotiate in the name of Rhodesian Blacks should be affirmed by some device other than participation in terrorism or support by the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet-Cuban assault is allowed to triumph, Rhodesia has only as much survivability as its enemies will permit it and as it can provide for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself. If the West acquiesces in the Soviet-Cuban assault the prognosis for Rhodesian survival is poor indeed. In place of Rhodesia will be created a Marxist-dominated Zimbabwe with Soviet influence in Africa extended to the banks of the Limpopo and Western influence shrunken to a precarious foothold near the Cape of Good Hope perimeter – if the surviving South African Government permits that foothold.

Should the Anglo-American initiative succeed, Mugabe and Nkomo would undoubtedly be represented in the new government of "Zimbabwe". It is likely that internal collapse of the economy and administration would ensue. The pattern of Mozambique, Angola, and some other African countries would be repeated. Civil war would be likely. Vast infusions of foreign aid and assistance would be needed. The Soviet saddle across Africa would be complete. The "blessed silence" that some so welcomed in Vietnam would descend on Zimbabwe. Unless Owen and Vance can find some formula for the transfer of power to a popularly elected government the future of Rhodesia under their formula is dark. With no protection for White minority rights, with no protection for the minority rights of black racial groupings not in power, and with the collapse of the agricultural, industrial, and trading economy, Rhodesia could rapidly revert to the bush as we have been warned all Africa might. Soviet domination of other Central African countries would obviously be facilitated, and the sum total effect would be little different from an outright Soviet-Cuban military victory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RICHARD E. WAGNER
Inheritance and the State
American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C., 1977

One of the major techniques by which socialism succeeded in winning control of Great Britain was through inheritance taxes. Now in the U.S.A. inheritance and estate tax laws of federal and state governments are destroying the ability of Americans to accumulate wealth and make their families financially independent of government.

In fact, according to Richard E. Wagner, writing in *Inheritance and the State*, "the progressive taxation of incomes and estates produces results that are clearly inconsistent with the desire to make it possible for all individuals to have reasonable opportunities to become wealthy."

Calling present tax laws "possibly even masochistic," Wagner says that "the penalties placed on the relatively fortunate rebound to the harm of the relatively less fortunate as well."

Explaining that: "High marginal rates of tax reduce the willingness of investors to undertake risky investments, which decreases the rate of mobility of individuals within the distribution of income," he concludes that: "Consequently, the wealthy and the poor are less likely to become wealthy than they would otherwise be."

Wagner is a professor of economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and the author of several books and numerous articles on taxes and the economy.

Taxes on the transfer of wealth at death are based on an extreme individualism at the expense of the concept of the family. "One primary impetus for imposing taxes upon the occasion of a person's death has been.... the desire to reduce the degree of inequality (between individuals) in the distribution of wealth," he says.

"But the taxation of wealth transfers also diminishes the incentive to accumulate capital to pass on to heirs. In consequence, the productive capacity of the nation is lowered, and, moreover, the character of the social order as it evolves historically may be modified."

Wagner also discusses such topics as the taxation of capital gains, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impact of transfer taxation upon total tax revenues, the liquidity problems of closely held businesses, charitable deductions, and the taxation of wealth transferred through trusts.

Writing about the changes contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1976, he argues that our tax laws should be changed to encourage people to earn more money rather than concentrate on equalizing the nation's wealth.

"Perhaps the most damaging argument against perfect equality as an ideal ..... is that it is an ideal under which few people would want to live," Wagner says.

"With rare exceptions, people seem to prefer to take a chance at earning an above-average income. One cannot win without taking a chance of losing, and few people play for ties."

If tax laws are changed to reduce the amount collected on monetary transactions, he argues, then more money could be invested in socially productive activities. "Billions of dollars are spent annually in trying to evade taxes, avoid taxes, seek out non taxable forms of income, and secure privileged tax treatment." His solution is simple: "The amount drained off by this excess burden, which is largely generated by the highly progressive structure of nominal rates of tax, could itself promote a substantial war on poverty."

ANTONY C. SUTTON
The War on Gold
'76 Press, Seal Beach, California, 1977

The United States held the largest reserves of gold in the world at the end of World War II, and was in a unique and financially unassailable position. Yet only three decades since then, the United States has become a prey to inflationary forces and has lost half of its gold stocks. Indeed, the United States now has a paper debt of a trillion-plus dollars, and is seeking to replace gold as a medium of international value by paper credit.

The author of *The War on Gold* clearly values gold as a standard of comparative value, against which national economies and national currencies can be measured. Unless such an external value measure exists, there is little pressure upon governments to maintain internal fiscal stability. Furthermore, without such an external standard of measure, any form of paper cerdits which are used for international exchange purposes may be readily manipul-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ated by those who control and manage such credits, thus denying nations even a relative degree of self-determination.

ALAIN DE BENOIST
Vu de Droite: Anthologie Critique des Idées Contemporaines
Copernic, 36 boulevard Exelmans, 75016 Paris, 1977

In this 600 page-plus anthology, the distinguished French writer Alain de Benoist has not merely collected a comprehensive anthology related to European conservative and "rightist" views; he has organized and synthesized these views to formulate a clear picture of a new political and social philosophy now emerging in Europe, with its center in Paris.

As clearly elucidated by de Benoist, this new approach to social and political philosophy maintains that political revolution is in reality preceded by social revolution, and that political philosophy can only be understood in the light of anthropology, sociology and biology – to which list we should add animal ethology.

Although this text is currently only available in French, it is of importance to American political and social scientists, since it represents the crest of a new wave of scholarly thought now gaining favor in non-socialist circles on the continent of Europe, which will inevitably reach the United States within the near future.

The Journal of Social and Political Studies (formerly known as *The Journal of Social and Political Affairs)* is published quarterly by the Council on American Affairs, from Suite 210, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., Washington D.C. 20036 (Telephone 202, 232-1040). The price for subscriptions is $10 per annum for private individuals and $20 per annum for libraries, institutions and other corporate bodies. Special reduced three year subscription rates are available, at a cost of $ 25 for individuals (twelve issues) and $55 for Libraries and other corporate bodies (twelve issues). Manuscripts are normally solicited by members of the editorial board, but members of the academic community and other interested readers are invited to consult the General Editor at the foregoing address should they be interested in submitting manuscripts. ISSN 0362-580X

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation armée

revue indépendante sur les problèmes de Défense nationale

directeur : Arnaud de Lagrange — rédacteur en chef : Philippe Conrad

Au sommaire du numéro 2 (mars-avril 1976) : *L'armée vue du Parti socialiste* (éditorial) / *Comment peut-on être cyrard ?* (entretien avec un élève-officier de Saint-Cyr Coëtquidan) / *Pacte de Varsovie : danger !* (amiral Sir Peter Hill Norton) / *Les pionniers de l'Europe populaire* (André de Fougerolles) / *Le bilan d'Helsinki* (Philippe Conrad) / *La nouvelle armée allemande* (François Dirksen) / *Guerre et paix* (Julien Freund) / *Pas de Défense sans volonté* (André Bonny) / etc.

Spécimen gratuit sur simple demande, en se recommandant de «Nouvelle Ecole».

BOITE POSTALE 284-16/75766 PARIS CEDEX 16

Erkenntnis

An International Journal of Analytical Philosophy

Editors: Carl G. Hempel, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.; Wolfgang Stegmüller, Universität München, München, Germany; Wilhelm K. Essler, Universität München, München, Germany.

Erkenntnis is a philosophical journal for foundational studies and scientific methodology. Its contributions cover the following areas: that field of philosophy associated today with the notions of 'Philosophy of Science' and 'Analytic Philosophy' (in a wide sense); the philosophy of language, of logic, and of mathematics; the foundational problems of physics and other natural sciences; the foundations of normative disciplines such as ethics, philosophy of law, and aesthetics, the methodology of the social sciences and the humanities; the history of scientific methods.

The decision to publish anew a journal under the name **Erkenntnis** calls for an explanation. It is not thought to make for a second time philosophical history with this name; nor will it be attempted to resurrect the philosophy of the Vienna and Berlin Circles – a well-nigh impossible task considering the 35 years that have elapsed since the old 'Erkenntnis' fell victim to the second world war, years in which the post-war philosophical discussion has in most respects progressed far beyond the positions of that time.

Building, though, both on the positive achievements and well-defined problems emerging from the critical discussion set in motion then, **Erkenntnis** stands well within the tradition of its predecessor with respect to its field of research. It also feels itself committed to that standard of conceptual clarity and rigor set by the old 'Erkenntnis'.

Subscription price per volume of 3 issues (500 pages) Dfl. 100,- / US $ 40.00 plus Dfl. 12,50 / US $ 5.00 for postage and handling. One volume will be published yearly. Personal subscription price on request. Copublished with Meiner Verlag, Hamburg.

D. Reidel Publishing Company

Dordrecht - Holland / Boston - U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Monographs published by

THE COUNCIL ON AMERICAN AFFAIRS

CHINA – THE TURNING POINT
Editor: Edwin J. Feulner Jr., (Director, House Republican Study Committee)
History of China, Political Situation in ROC, Chinese Economy, Report from the Mainland, 'The Normalization Process', Military Balance in East Asia, Elitism in Mainland China, Soviet Role in the Triangular Relationship, Overseas Chinese and SE Asia, China and the UN, Future US Policy toward China. Contributors include: Rep. Edward Derwinski, Rep. Lester Wolff, Dr. Richard Walker (Dir. International Relations, U.S.C.), Dr. Franz Michael (Chairman, Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University), Dr. Ray Cline (Dir. Center for Strategic Studies, George Washington U.), Dr. J. Schiebel (Dir. Russian Area Studies, Georgetown U.).

SOUTH AFRICA – THE VITAL LINK
Editor Robert Schuettinger (US Congress staff)
History of South Africa, South Africa and UN, South African Policy of Detente, Political and Civil Liberty, Emerging Bantu Nations, South-West Africa, Military Balance and Sea-Lanes, Terrorism in South Africa, US Arms Sales and Trade with South Africa, Contributors include: US Senator Carl Curtis, Rep. John H. Dent, Robert Moss (Foreign Report editor, The Economist), Edwin J. Feulner Jr (Dir. House Republican Study Com.), John O'Sullivan (London Daily Telegraph), Dr. John Tierney (Dir. House National Security Research Group), Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham (former Dir. US Military Intelligence) Dr. Craig Roberts (US Congress Staff), Dr. William Schneider (US Senate Staff).

CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS TO UNION POWER
By Philip Bradley Ph.D.
A Phi Beta Kappa, Guggenheim scholar and former Harvard economics professor, author of Involuntary Participation in Unionism, and Labor and the Public State in Union Power, examines key legal decisions in the light of the United States Constitution, and explains how the Fifth and Ninth Amendments can be applied by the courts to limit the exercise by Congress of its power under the Commerce Clause, and that through these Amendments the Constitution provides an effective barrier against the creation of pre-totalitarian labor institutions.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY
By Robert L. Schuettinger (US Congress staff)
The author, Senior Research Associate on the US House of Representatives Republican Study Committee and former lecturer at Yale University and the Catholic University of America, examines the serious financial problems facing the American Social Security system. This amply documented work provides an up to date and comprehensive survey of facts and figures relating to a major sphere of US fiscal responsibility.

KOREA IN THE WORLD TODAY
Editor: Roger Pearson Ph.D.
Korea's Role in World History, Korea at the UN, Military Balance in Korean Peninsula, Human Rights in North and South Korea, Korea, Korean Economy, Balance of Power in Northeast Asia, Military Preparedness of ROK, Recommendations for the Future. Contributors include: US Senator Jake Garn, Rep. John M. Murphy, Dr. J.E. Dornan (Chairman, Politics, Catholic U.), Dr Donald J.Senese (US Congress-Staff), Dr. William J. Schneider (US Senate Staff), James R. Streeter (US Congress Staff.)

SINO-SOVIET INTERVENTION IN AFRICA
Editor: Roger Pearson Ph.D.
SouthWest Africa and Rhodesia-Africa's FEBA, The Lessons of Angola, The Terrorist War in Rhodesia, Strategic Routes in and around South Africa, World Economic Implications, Ethiopia, Benin and the Guineas, The Soviet Presence in Somalia, China and Africa, The Decline of the West in Africa – Is the Trend Irreversible? Contributors include US Senator Dewey F. Bartlett, US Senator James A. McClure, US Rep. Larry McDonald, Dr. Alvin J. Cottrell (Director Research, Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown U.), Dr. Walter Darnell Jacobs (Editor, Spotlight on Africa), Dr. Peter Vannemam, Dr. John J. Tierney.

The above monographs are available from the Council on American Affairs, Suite 210, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036, at the price of $5.00 each, postage free. Special Discounts on bulk purchases.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED